THE

Council of Trent

EXAMIN'D and DISPROV'D

BY

Catholick Tradition.

In the main Points in Controverſie between Us and the *Church of Rome*;

WITH

A Particular Account of the Times and Occaſions of introducing them;

PART I.

To which a PREFACE is prefixed concerning the true Senſe of the Council of *Trent* and the Notion of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

The Second Edition Corrected.

WITH

An APPENDIX in Anſwer to ſome late Paſſages of *J. W.* of the Society of Jeſus, Concerning the Prohibiting of *Scripture* in Vulgar Languages.

L O N D O N,
Printed for *H. Mortlock* at the *Phœnix* in S. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1688.

THE

Council of Trent

EXAMIN'D and DISPROV'D

BY

Catholick Tradition.

BY

Dr. Stillingfleet.

The Second Edition Corrected.

Imprimatur Liber cui Titulus
(*The Council of* Trent *Examin'd and disprov'd by Catholick Tradition,* &c.

Feb. 7. 1687. *H. Maurice* R^mo in Christo P. D. *Wilhelmo* Archiep. *Cant.* à Sacris.

THE

Council of Trent

EXAMIN'D and DISPROV'D

BY

Catholick Tradition.

In the main Points in Controverſie between Us and the *Church of Rome*;

WITH

A Particular Account of the Times and Occaſions of introducing them;

PART I.

To which a PREFACE is prefixed concerning the true Senſe of the Council of *Trent* and the Notion of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

The Second Edition Corrected.

WITH

An APPENDIX in Anſwer to ſome late Paſſages of *J. W.* of the Society of Jeſus, Concerning the Prohibiting of *Scripture* in Vulgar Languages.

LONDON,
Printed for *H. Mortlock* at the *Phœnix* in S. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1688.

THE PREFACE.

THere is it ſeems a Train *in* Controverſies, *as well as in* Thoughts; *one thing ſtill giving a ſtart to another*; Conferences *produce* Letters; Letters, Books; *and one* Diſcourſe *gives* Occaſion *for another. For this follows the former as a neceſſary* Purſuit *of the ſame Argument againſt* Tradition.

I. S. *in his laſt* Letter, *had vouched the* Authority *of the* Council *of* Trent *proceeding upon* Tradition, *and he inſtanced in three Points*, Tranſubſtantiation, Sacramental Confeſſion *and* Extreme Unction. *The Examination of this I thought fit to reſerve for a* Diſcourſe *by it ſelf; wherein, inſtead of confining my Self to thoſe three Particulars, I intend to go through the moſt material Points there eſtabliſhed, and to prove from the moſt Authentick Teſtimonies, that there was no* true Catholick Tradition *for any of them. And if I can make good what I have undertaken, I ſhall make the* Council *of* Trent *it* Self *the great Inſtance againſt the* Infallibility *of* Tradition. Third Letter p. 64.

This is a new Undertaking; which the impetuouſneſs of our Adverſaries ſetting up Tradition *for the Ground of their Faith, hath brought me to. But beſides the ſhewing that really they have not* Tradition *on their ſide; I have endeavoured to trace the ſeveral ſteps and to ſet down the* Times *and* Occaſions *of Introducing thoſe Points which have*

have caused that unhappy breach in the Christian world, whose sad effects we daily see and lament, But have little hopes to see remied, till these new Points be discarded and Scripture interpreted by truely Catholick Tradition, *be made the Standard of Christian Communion.*

I do not pretend, that all these Points came in at one Time or in the same Manner; for some Errours and Corruptions came in far more early; some had the favour of the Church *of* Rome *in a higher degree; some were more generally received in the Practice of the Church in later times, than others; and some were merely* School Points *before the Council of* Trent, *but as far as the* Thomists *and* Scotists *could be made to agree there against the Reformers, these passed for* Articles *of* Faith. *For, this was one of the great Arts of that* Council *to draw up their* Decrees *in such Terms, as should leave Room enough for Eternal Wranglings among themselves, provided they agreed in doing the business effectually against the* Heretick*s, as they are pleased to call them. I therefore forbear to urge these as* Points *of* Faith, *which have been freely debated among themselves since the* Council *of* Trent, *without any Censure. We have enough in the plain* Decrees *and* Canons *of that* Council, *without medling with any* School-Points. *And so I cannot be charged with* Misrepresenting.

The great Debate of late hath been about the true Exposition *of the* Points *there defined; and for my part, I am content to yield to any just and reasonable Methods of giving the* true sense *of them. And such I conceive these to be,*

I. *Where the* Council *of* Trent *makes use of Words in a* strict *and* limited Sense, *there it is unreasonable to understand them in a* large *and* improper Sense. *As for instance,* Sess. 6. *c.* 26. *It decrees that Justified Persons do*

do verè promerere; *truely merit Eternal Life*; *and* Can. 32. *there is an* Anathema *againſt him who denies* true Merit in the good Works of juſtified Perſons, both as to Increaſe of Grace and Eternal Life. *There is no one converſant in Ancient Writers, but knows that there was a large and improper Senſe of the Word* Merit; *but how is it impoſſible to apply that Senſe, where ſuch Care is taken, that it may be underſtood in a ſtrict and limited Senſe? If the Council had left the Word in its General Senſe, there might have been Reaſon to have given the faireſt Interpretation to it; but when it is certainly known, that there had been a difference of Opinions in the* Church *of* Rome *about* true and proper Merit, *and that which was not* (*however it were called*,) *and the* Council *declares for the former, no man of underſtanding can believe that onely the* improper Senſe *was meant by it. As in the Point of the* Euchariſt *when the* Council *declares that the words of Chriſt,* This is my Body, *are* truely and properly *to be underſtood; Would it not be thought ſtrange for any one to ſay, that the* Council *notwithſtanding might mean that Chriſt's Words may be figuratively underſtood? And we muſt take the* true notion *of Merit not from any large expreſſions of the Ancients, but from the Conditions of* true and proper Merit *among themſelves. But of this at large afterwards. So as to the Notion of* Sacraments; *every one knows how largely that Word was taken in Ancient Writers; but it would be abſurd to underſtand the* Council *of* Trent *in that Senſe, when* Seſſ. 6. Can. 1. De Sacramentis, *it denounces an* Anathema *not merely againſt him* that denies ſeven Sacraments; *but againſt him* that doth not hold every one of them to be truely and properly a Sacrament. *And in the* Creed *of* Pius IV. *one Article is, that there are* ſeven true and proper Sacraments *How vain a thing then were it for any*

to

to Expound the Sacraments *in a large and improper Sense?*

II. *Where the* Council *of* Trent *hath not declared it ſelf, but it is fully done in the* Catechiſm *made by its Appointment, we ought to look on that, as the* true Senſe *of the* Council. *As in the Caſe of the* Sacraments; *the* Council *never declares what it means by* true and proper Sacraments; *but the* Catechiſm *makes large and full amends for this Defect. For after it hath mention'd the uſe of the Word in Profane and Sacred Writers, it ſets down the Senſe of it according to their Divines for a* ſenſible ſign which conveys the Grace which it ſignifies. *And after a large Explication of the Nature of Signs, it gives this Deſcription of a true and proper Sacrament,* that it is a ſenſible thing, which by Divine Inſtitution not only hath the force of ſignifying but of cauſing Grace. *And to ſhew the Authority of this* Catechiſm *for explicating the* Doctrine *of the* Sacraments *we need only to look into* Seſſ. 24. c. 7. de Reform. where it is required that the People be inſtructed in the Sacraments according to it. *It is ſuppoſed that the* Catechiſm *was appointed to be made in the* 18th Seſſion *at the Inſtigation of* Carolus Borromæus, *(ſince* Canonized*) but it was not finiſhed while the* Council *ſate, and therefore* Seſſ. 25. it was refer'd to the Judgment and Authority of the Pope. *I confeſs therefore it hath not a* Conciliar Authority *ſtamped upon it, but it hath a ſort of* transfuſed Infallibility, *as far as they could convey it; and as much as a* Council *hath, when it borrows it from the* Popes Confirmation. *It was near two Years hammering at* Trent, viz. *from* 26. *of* Feb. 1562. *to* Decemb. 1563. *when the* Council *roſe; Afterwards, it was preparing at* Rome *three Years longer, and then preſented to the Pope to be approved, and publiſhed by his Authority, after it had been*

Catechiſm Rom. Part 2.

carefully

carefully review'd by Cardinal Sirlet, Borromeo, *and others; and hath since been universally received in the* Roman Church; *so that we can have no more Authentick* Exposition *of the* Sense *of the* Council *of* Trent, *than what is contained in that* Catechism.

III. *Where the* Council *of* Trent *declares a thing in general to be* lawfull *and* due, *but doth not express the* manner *of it, that is to be understood from the generally receiv'd and allowed Practices at that time. For, otherwise the* Council *must be charged with great unfaithfulness in not setting down and correcting publick and notorious Abuses, when it mention'd the things themselves and some Abuses about them. As in the* 25th Session, *concerning* Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images *and* Relicks, *it goes no farther than* that the sound Doctrine be taught, that Saints are to be Invocated, Images and Relicks to be Worship'd; *but never defines what* that sound Doctrine *is, what* bounds *are to be set in the* Worship of Saints, Images *and* Relicks, *which it is unlawfull to exceed. So that in this Case, we have no other way to judge of the Meaning of the Council, but by comparing the* Publick and Allow'd Practices *of the* Church *with the General* Decrees *of the* Council. *And we have this farther Reason for it, that we are told by the latest Expositors of it, that the* Sense *of the* Church *in* speculative Points, *is to be taken from* Publick Practices. *For, thus one of them expresses himself,* Moreover, even her Speculative Doctrines are so mixed with Practical Ceremonies, which represent them to the Vulgar, and instruct even the meanest Capacities in the abstrusest Doctrines, that it seems ever impossible to make an alteration in her Doctrine without abrogating her Ceremonies, or changing her constant Practices.

Reply to the Defence of the Exposition, &c. P. 134.

IV. *Where the Decrees of the Council, are not ſufficiently clear, there we muſt take in the* Canons *to make the* Senſe *more plain. This* Rule *I take from the* Council *it ſelf, which in the* 6th Seſſion, *juſt before the* Canons *ſaith,* that thoſe are added, that all may know not only what they are to hold and follow, but what they are to ſhun and avoid. *As in the famous Inſtance of* Tranſubſtantiation; *ſuppoſe, that the Words of the* Decree *do not determine expreſly the* Modus; *yet it is impoſſible for any one to doubt of it who looks into the* Canon, *which denounces an* Anathema *againſt him, not only that* denies Tranſubſtantiation, *but that* aſſerts the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine to remain after Conſecration. *Therefore he that aſſerts* Tranſubſtantiation *according to the* Council *of* Trent, *muſt hold it in ſuch a* manner, *as thereby to underſtand* that the Subſtance of Bread and Wine doth not remain. *Otherwiſe he is under an* Anathema *by the expreſs* Canon *of the Council.*

Seſſ. 13. Can. 2.

Therefore it is ſo far from being a fatal Overſight, (*as a late Author expreſſes it,*) to ſay that the Council of Trent hath determin'd the Modus of the Real Preſence, *that no man who is not reſolved* to overſee it *can be of another Opinion. And herein the* Divines *of the Church of* Rome *do agree with us,* viz. *that the particular* Modus *is not only determin'd by the* Council, *but that it is a* Matter *of* Faith *to all Perſons of the Communion of that Church. As not only appears from the* 2d Canon, *but from the very* Decree *it ſelf,* Seſſ. 13. ch. 4.

The holy Synod declares, that by Conſecration of the Bread and Wine, there is a Converſion of the whole Subſtance of the Bread into the Subſtance of the Body of Chriſt, and of the whole Subſtance of the Wine into the Subſtance of his Blood, which Converſion is fitly and

and properly by the holy Catholick Church called Tranſubſtantiation. *In which Words the* Council *doth plainly expreſs the* Modus *of the* Real Preſence *to be, not by a Preſence of* Chriſt's Body *together with the* Subſtance of the Bread, *as the* Lutherans *held, but by a* Converſion of the whole Subſtance of the Bread into the Subſtance of the Body, &c. *And ſince there were different* Manners *of underſtanding this* Real Preſence, *if the* Council *did not Eſpouſe one ſo, as to reject the other as* Heretical; *then it is impoſſible to make the* Lutheran *Doctrine to be declared to be* Heretical, *i. e, unleſs the* Council *did determine the* Modus *of the* Real Preſence. *For, if it did not, then notwithſtanding the* Decrees *and* Canons *of the* Council *of* Trent, *Perſons are at liberty to believe either* Tranſubſtantiation *or* Conſubſtantiation, *which I think no* Roman Catholick *will allow.*

But it is ſaid, that the meaning of the Decree *is,* that the Real Preſence is not to be underſtood after a Natural, but a Sacramental Manner; *But doth it not plainly tell us, how that* Sacramental Manner *is to be underſtood,* viz. by a Converſion of the whole Subſtance of the Bread into the whole Subſtance of the Body, &c. *And if other ways be poſſible, and all others be rejected, then this particular* Modus *muſt be determin'd.*

I grant, that the Council *doth not ſay,* there is an Annihilation of the Elements; *and I know no Neceſſity of uſing that Term, for that which is ſuppoſed to be turned into another thing cannot properly be ſaid to be* Annihilated *(which is the reducing it to nothing) but the* Council *doth aſſert* a Total Converſion of one Subſtance into another, *and where that is, that* Subſtance *muſt wholly ceaſe to be what it was; and ſo, there can be no Subſtance of the Elements remaining after Conſecration. For, as* Aquinas *obſerves,* Quod convertitur in aliquid factâ Converſione

3 Q. 75. A. 2. non manet. *If then the* Subſtance *of the Elements doth not remain after Conſecration, by virtue of this* total Converſion, *then the* Council *of* Trent *by its* Decree *hath plainly determin'd the* Modus *of the* Real Preſence, *ſo as to exclude any ſuch* Manner, *as doth ſuppoſe, the* Subſtance *to remain, whether it be by* Impanation *or* Conſubſtantiation, *or any other way.*

What if *Rupertus* thought the Bread might become the Real Body of Chriſt by an Union of the Word to it? *All that can be infer'd is, that the* Modus *was not then ſo determin'd, as to oblige all Perſons to hold it. But what is this to the* Council *of* Trent? *Can any one hold the* Subſtance *to remain, and not to remain at the ſame time? For, he that holds with* Rupertus *muſt allow the Subſtance to remain; he that believes a total Converſion muſt deny it. And he that can believe both theſe at once, may believe what he pleaſes.*

But the Council only declares the Sacramental Preſence to be after an ineffable manner. *I ſay, it determines it to be by* a total Converſion of one Subſtance into another; *which may well be ſaid to be* ineffable, *ſince what cannot be underſtood can never be expreſſed.*

Our Diſpute is not about the uſe of the Word, Tranſubſtantiation, *for I think it proper enough to expreſs the Senſe of the* Council *of* Trent; *but as the Word* Conſubſtantial *did exclude all other* Modes *how Chriſt might be* the Son of God, *and determin'd the Faith of the Church to that* Manner; *ſo doth the Senſe of* Tranſubſtantiation, *as determin'd by the Council of* Trent, *limit the* Manner *of the* Real Preſence, *to ſuch a* Converſion *of the* Subſtance *of the Elements into the* Subſtance of Chriſt's Body and Blood, *as doth imply no Subſtance to remain after Conſecration.*

It is to no purpose to tell us, the Council uses only the Word Species and not Accidents; *for whatever they are called, the* Council *denounces its* Anathema *against those* who hold the Substance to remain after Consecration; and denies the Total Conversion of the Substance of the Bread and Wine into the Substance of the Body and Bloud of Christ. *If the* Substance *be not there, the* Modus *is to purpose determin'd. And whatever remains, call it what you will, it is not the* Substance; *and that is sufficient to shew, that the* Council *of* Trent *hath clearly determin'd the* Modus *of the* Real Presence.

V. *We must distinguish the* School Points *left undetermin'd by the* Council *of* Trent, *from those which are made* Articles *of* Faith. *We never pretend, that it left no* School-Disputes *about the Points there determin'd; but we say it went too far in making some* School-Points *to be Points of Faith, when it had been more for the Peace of Christendom to have left them to the* Schools *still. Thus in the Point of* Transubstantiation, *the elder* School-men *tell us, there were different Ways of explaining the* Real Presence; *And that those, which supposed the substance to remain,* were more agreeable to Reason and Scripture than the other; *and some were of Opinion,* that the *Modus* was no matter of Faith then. *But after the Point of the* Real Presence *came to be warmly contested in the time of* Berengarius, *it rose by degrees higher and higher, till at last the particular* Modus *came to be determin'd with an* Anathema *by the* Council *of* Trent.

When Berengarius, *A. D.* 1059. *was forced to Recant by* Nicolaus 2d, *with the Assistance of* 113. *Bishops; no more was required of him,* than to hold that the Bread and Wine after Consecration; are not only the Sacrament, but the true Body and Bloud of Christ, and that

it

it is ſenſibly handled and broke by the Prieſts hands, and eaten by the Communicants. *Here is no denying the* Subſtance *of* Bread *to remain; and* Joh. Pariſienſis *obſerves, that the words cannot be defended but by an* Aſſumption *of the Bread; for, ſaith he,* If the Body of Chriſt be truely and ſenſibly handled and eaten, this cannot be underſtood of Chriſt's Glorious Body in Heaven, but it muſt be of the Bread really made the Body of Chriſt after Conſecration.

The Senſe which the Canoniſts *put upon the Words of this* Recantation *is abſurd,* viz. that they are to be underſtood of the Species; *For* Berengarius *his Opinion related to the* Subſtance of Chriſt's Body *which he denied to be in the Sacrament. And what would it have ſignified for him to have ſaid* that Chriſt was ſenſibly broken and eaten under the Species of Bread and Wine? *i. e. that his Body was not ſenſibly broken and eaten but the* Species *were. It had ſignified ſomething, if he had ſaid,* there was no Subſtance of Bread and Wine left but only the Species. *But all the deſign of this Recantation was to make him aſſert the* Sacrament to be made the true and real Body of Chriſt *in as ſtrong a manner, as the Pope and his Brethren could think of. And although the* Canoniſts *think,* if ſtrictly *taken,* it implies greater Hereſie than that of Berengarius; *yet by their favour, this Form was only thought fit to be put into the* Canon-Law, *as the Standard of the Faith of the* Roman Church *then; and the following* Abjuration *of* Berengarius *was only kept in the* Regiſter *of* Gregory the ſeventh's Epiſtles.

For about twenty years after by Order of Gregory VII. Berengarius *was brought to another* Abjuration, *but by no means* after the ſame Form with the former. *For by this he was required to declare,* that the Bread and Wine are ſubſtantially Converted into the true and proper Fleſh and Bloud

Bloud of Chriſt, and after Conſecration are the true Body of Chriſt born of the Virgin and Sacrificed upon the Croſs, and that ſits at the right hand of the Father; and the true Bloud of Chriſt which was ſhed out of his Side, not only as a Sacramental Sign, but in propriety of Nature and Reality of Subſtance.

This was indeed a pretty bold Aſſertion of the Subſtantial Preſence. *And ſo much the bolder, if the* Commentary *on S.* Matthew *be* Hildebrand's. *For there he ſaith,* the manner of the Converſion is uncertain. *But as far as I can judge, by* Subſtantial Converſion *he did not then mean, as the* Council *of* Trent *doth,* a total Converſion of one ſubſtance into another, ſo as that nothing of the former Subſtance remains; *but* that there was a Change by Conſecration not by making the Body of Chriſt of the Subſtance of the Bread, but by its paſſing into that Body of Chriſt which was born of the Virgin. *For, upon comparing the two Forms, there we ſhall find lies the main difference. Pope* Nicolaus *went no farther than to* the true Body of Chriſt; *which it might be as well by* Aſſumption, *as* Converſion; Gregory VII. *went farther and thought it neceſſary to add that the Change was into the* Subſtance of that Body which was born of the Virgin, *&c. And ſo this ſecond Form excludes a true Body merely by* Aſſumption, *and aſſerts the Change to be into the* Subſtance of Chriſt's Body in Heaven; *but it doth not determine, that nothing of the* Subſtance *of the* Elements *doth remain. For when he puts* that kind of Subſtantial Converſion which leaves nothing but the Accidents, and the Body of Chriſt to be under them, which belonged to the Subſtance of the Elements; *he declares* this matter to be uncertain. *Which ſhews, that however a* Change *was owned into the* Subſtance *of* Chriſt's Body, *yet ſuch a* total Converſion, *as is determined*

mined by the Council *of* Trent, *was not then made an Article of Faith.*

But from this ſuppoſition made by Hildebrand *it appears, that the Doctrine of* Subſtance *and* Accidents *was then well known; and therefore the introducing* Ariſtotle's Philoſophy *from the* Arabians *afterwards could make no Alteration in this Matter. For the words of* Hildebrand *are as plain as to the difference of* Subſtance *and* Accidents, *as of any of the* School-men; *and that the* Accidents *of the Bread and Wine might be ſeparated from the Subſtance of them; but this was not then made a Matter of Faith; as it was afterwards.*

But the caſe was remarkably alter'd, after the Lateran Council *under* Innocent *III. For* Tranſubſtantiation *being admitted there among the* Articles *of* Faith; *and ſo entred in the* Canon-Law *in the very beginning of the* Decretals; *this did not merely become a* School-Term, *but by the* Inquiſitors *of that time, it was accounted* Hereſie *to deny it. It may be ſufficiently proved by the* School-men *and* Canoniſts, *that a difference of* Opinions, *as to the* Modus *did ſtill continue, (but that belongs to a more proper place) and* Joh. Pariſienſis *declares* (p. 103.) that the Lateran Council in his Opinion did not make Tranſubſtantiation a Point of Faith; or at leaſt that Subſtance was not to be taken for the Matter, but the Suppoſitum; *but the* Inquiſitors *went more briskly to work and made it downright* Hereſie *to aſſert*, that the Subſtance of the Elements did remain after Conſecration.

Of this, we have full Evidence in the Regiſter *of* Courtney Arch-Biſhop *of* Canterbury, (*which is* no Inviſible Manuſcript.) *For there we read* f. 25. *that he called a ſelect* Convocation *of* Biſhops, Divines *and* Canoniſts, May 17. *A. D.* 1382. *to declare ſome Propoſitions to be* Heretical, *and ſome to be* Erroneous *and* contrary to the deter-

determination of the Church. *Among the first, these two are set down in the first Place,*

1. That the material Substance of the Bread and Wine doth remain in the Sacrament of the Altar after Consecration.

2. That the Accidents do not remain without their Subject in that Sacrament after Consecration.

After this the Arch-Bishop *sent forth his Mandate to all his* Suffragans *not only to prohibit the preaching of that Doctrine, but to inquire after those who did it. And June* 12. Robert Rygge Chancellour *of* Oxford *and* Thomas Brightwall *appeared before him and were examined upon these Propositions; which they declared to be* Heretical: *who thereupon required the Publication of them as such in the* University; *and the proceeding against those who were suspected to favour them.*

The Ground the Arch-Bishop *went upon, was,* that these had been already condemned by the Church, *and therefore* ex abundanti, they declared them to be so condemned; *as appears by the* Monition *given to* Robert Rygge *himself as too much suspected to favour the contrary Doctrine; as well as* Nicholas Hereford, Philip Reppyndon *D. D. and* John Ashton *B. D.*

Against these the Arch-Bishop *proceeded as* Inquisitor Hæreticæ Pravitatis per totam suam Provinciam, *as it is in the* Record; *who appearing desired a Copy of the several* Propositions, *and then they were required to give in their judgment upon them.* Ashton *refused, but the other promised, which they performed soon after; and to these two Propositions, their Answers were,*

To the first that as far as it was contrary to the Decretal, *Firmiter Credimus,* it was Heresie.

To the second that as far as it was contrary to the Decretal, *Cum Marthæ,* it was Heresie.

Theſe Anſwers were judged inſufficient, *becauſe they did not declare what that* Senſe *was. And the* Arch-Biſhop *put this Queſtion to them,* whether the ſame Numerical material Bread which before Conſecration was ſet upon the Altar, did remain in its proper Subſtance and Nature after Conſecration, *but they would give no other Anſwer at that time. But afterwards* Reppyndon *abjured, and was made* Biſhop *of* Lincoln.

From hence it appears, that it was then thought that the Modus *was ſo far determin'd by the* Lateran Council, *that the* contrary Doctrine was *declared not merely* Erroneous in Faith, *but* Heretical.

In the firſt Convocation *held by* Th. Arundel Arch-
Regiſt. f. 47. Biſhop *of* Canterbury *A. D.* 1396, *A Complaint was brought, that ſeveral* Divines *and others of the* Univerſity *of* Oxford *held ſome* heretical *and* erroneous *opinions; the firſt whereof was,*

That the Subſtance of Bread doth remain after Conſecration; and doth not ceaſe to be Bread; *which is there affirmed* to be Hereſie, ſpeaking of material Bread.

The ſecond, that the Court of *Rome* in the *Can. Ego* Berengarius, had determined that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is naturally true Bread.

It is very hard to ſay, how this came to be then accounted Heretical Doctrine, when no leſs a man than Durandus *in the ſame Age affirms,* that the Canoniſts grant that the Opinion of the ceaſing of the Subſtance was grounded on the *Can.* Firmiter Credimus, *i. e. on the* Lateran Council; but that of the remaining of the Subſtance on that, *Ego,* Berengarius. *But however it paſſed for* Heretical, *or at leaſt very* Erroneous *Doctrine here; but the main* Hereſie *was to hold,* that the Subſtance remained.

For

For A.D. 1400. (*as appears by the* Regiſter *p.* 2. *f.* 179.) William Sawtre *alias* Chatris *a Parochial Prieſt in* London, *was ſummoned before the ſame* Arch-Biſhop *in* Convocation *upon an Information of* Hereſie; *and one of the main Articles againſt him was that he held* the Subſtance of the Bread to remain in the Sacrament of the Altar after Conſecration; and that it doth not ceaſe to be Bread. Sawtre *anſwered, that he believed,* that after Conſecration the Bread did remain with the Body of Chriſt; but it doth not ceaſe to be ſimply Bread, but it remains holy and true the Bread of Life and Body of Chriſt. *The* Arch Biſhop *examined him chiefly upon this Article; and becauſe he did not anſwer home to the point, he was condemned for a* Heretick, *and was the firſt who was burned for* Hereſie *in* England. *And yet his Anſwer was,* that he could not underſtand the matter; *then the* Arch-Biſhop *asked him,* if he would ſtand to the Churches Determination; *he ſaid,* he would ſo far as it was not contrary to the Will of God. *Upon which he was declared an* Heretick *and delivered over to the Secular Power.*

In the ſame Convocation John Purvey *made an* Abjuration *of* Hereſie, *and the firſt he renounced was* that after Conſecration in the Sacrament of the Altar, there neither is, nor can be an Accident without a Subject, and that the ſame Subſtance and Nature of Bread remained which was before.

In the Examination *of* William Thorp *by* Thomas Arundel, Arch-Biſhop *of* Canterbury *A. D.* 1407. (*which is not in the* Regiſter *being defective, but the account is preſerved from his own Copy*) *The* Arch-Biſhop *declared,* that the Church had now determined, that there abideth no Subſtance of Bread after Conſecration in the Sacrament of the Altar. And that if he believed otherwiſe he did not believe as the Church believed. Thorp

quoted S. Auguſtin *and* Fulgentius *to prove* that the Subſtance remained; and the very Maſs on Chriſtmas Day. *The* Arch-Biſhop *ſtill preſſed him with* the Churches Determination. Thorp *ſaid* this was a School-nicety whether Accidents could be without a Subject; *no, ſaid the* Arch-Biſhop, it is the Faith of the Church I go upon. Thorp *replyed*, it was not ſo for a thouſand years after Chriſt.

Regiſtr. *Arundel* p. 2. f. 143.

In the Examination of the Lord Cobham *A. D.* 1412. *by the ſame* Arch-Biſhop *we find that he owned* the Real Preſence of Chriſt's Body *as firmly as his Accuſers; but he was condemned for* Hereſie, Becauſe he held the Subſtance of Bread to remain. *For the* Arch-Biſhop *declared this to be the Senſe of the* Church; that after Conſecration, remaineth no material Bread or Wine which were before, they being turned into Chriſt's very Body and Bloud. *The Original words of the* Arch-Biſhop *as they are in the* Regiſter, *are theſe.*

The Faith and the determination of holy Church touching the bleſſfull Sacrament of the auter is this, that after the Sacramental Words ben ſaid by a Preſt in his Maſſe, the material bred that was before is turned into Chriſt's veray body. And the material Wyn that was before is turned into Chriſt veray blode, and ſo there leweth in the auter, no material brede ne material Wyn the wich wer ther byfore the ſaying of the Sacramental words.

And the Biſhops *afterwards ſtood up and ſaid*; It is manifeſt Hereſie to ſay that it is Bread after the Sacramental Words be ſpoken; becauſe it was againſt the Determination of holy Church.

But to make all ſure, not many years after, May 4*th. A. D.* 1415. *the* Council *of* Conſtance *Seſſion* 8. *declared the two* Propoſitions *before mentioned to be* heretical; *viz.*

viz. to hold that the Substance doth remain after Consecration, and that the Accidents do not remain without a Subject.

Let any impartial Reader now judge, whether it be any fatal Oversight *to assert,* that the Modus of the Real Presence was determin'd by the Council of Trent, *when there were so many leading Determinations to it, which were generally owned and received in the* Church *of* Rome. *But there were other* Disputes *remaining in the* Schools *relating to this* Matter; *which we do not pretend were ever determin'd by the* Council *of* Trent. *As,*

(1.) *Whether the Words of* Consecration *are to be understood in a* Speculative *or* Practical Sense? *For, the* Scotists *say, in the former Sense, they do by no means prove Transubstantiation; since it may be truly said* This is my Body, *though the Substance of Bread do remain; and that they are to be understood in* a Practical Sense, *i. e. for converting the Bread into the Body, is not to be deduced* ex vi verborum, *from the mere force of the Words, but from the Sense of the Church which hath so understood them. Which in plain terms is to say, it cannot be proved from* Scripture, *but from the Sense of the Church; and so* Scotus *doth acknowledge, but then he adds,* that we are to judge this to be the Sense of Scripture, becaufe the Church hath declared it. Which he doth not think was done before the Council of *Lateran. So that, this Council must be believed to have had as Infallible a Spirit in giving this Sense of* Scripture *as there was in the writing of it; since it is not drawn from the Words, but added to them. On the other side, the* Thomists *insist on the force of the Words themselves; for, if, say they, from the Words be infer'd that there is a Real Presence of the Substance of Christ's Body, then it follows thence,*

thence, that there is no Substance of the Bread remaining; for a Substance cannot be where it was not before, but it must either change its place, or another must be turned into it; as Fire in a House must either be brought thither, or some other thing must be turned into Fire; but, say they, the Body of Christ cannot be brought from Heaven thither, for then it must leave the place it had there; and must pass through all the Bodies between; and it is impossible for the same Body to be Locally present in several places; and therefore the Body of Christ cannot otherwise be really and substantially present, but by the Conversion of the Substance of the Bread into it.

(2.) *In what* Manner *the* Body of Christ *is made to be present in the Sacrament? The* Scotists *say, it is impossible to conceive it otherwise than by bringing it from the place where it already is; the* Thomists *say that is impossible, since that Body must be divided from it self by so many other Bodies interposing. The former is said to be an* adductive *Conversion, the latter a* productive; *but then here lies another difficulty, how there can be a productive Conversion of a thing already in being. But my business is not to give an account of these* School-Disputes; *but to shew how different they were from the point of* Transubstantiation; *and that both these disputing Parties did agree that the* Modus *of the* Real Presence *was defined to be* by changing the Substance of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ; *but they still warmly disputed about the* Modus *of that* Modus; *viz. how a Body already in being could be present in so many places without leaving that Place where it was already. And no Man who hath ever look'd into these* School-Disputes *can ever imagine that they disputed about the Truth of the Doctrine of* Transubstantiation, *but only about the* manner *of explaining*

ing

ing it. Wherein they do effectually overthrow each others Notions without being able to eſtabliſh their own ; as the Elector *of* Cologn *truly obſerved of their Debates about this matter in the* Council *of* Trent.

VI. *Where the Senſe of Words hath been changed by the introducing new Doctrine, there the words ought to be underſtood according to the Doctrine at that time received. Of this we have two remarkable Inſtances in the* Council *of* Trent ;

The firſt is about Indulgences, *which that* Council *in its laſt* Seſſion *never went about to define ; but made uſe of the old Word, and ſo declares both Scripture and Antiquity for the uſe of them. But there had been a mighty change in the Doctrine about them, ſince the Word was uſed in the Chriſtian Church. No doubt there was a Power in the Church to relax* Canonical Penances *in extraordinary Caſes ; but what could that ſignifie when the* Canonical Diſcipline *was laid aſide, and a new Method of dealing with Penitents was taken up, and another Trade driven with Reſpect to* Purgatory Pains ? *For here was a new thing carried on under an old Name. And that hath been the great Artifice of the Roman Church ; where it hath evidently gone off from the* old Doctrines, *yet to retain the* old Names, *that the unwary might ſtill think, the things were the ſame, becauſe the Names were. As in the preſent Caſe, we deny not the uſe of* Indulgences *in the* Primitive Church ; *as the Word was uſed for* Relaxations *of the* Canonical Diſcipline ; *but we utterly deny it as to the* Pains *of* Purgatory. *And that this was the Senſe then receiv'd in the* Church *of* Rome, *appears from the Papal Conſtitutions of* Boniface *the* 8th, Clemens *the* 6th, *and* Leo *the* 10th. *But of theſe more hereafter.*

The

The other Instance is in the Word Species *used by the* Council *of* Trent, Sess. 13. Can. 2. *where* an Anathema is denounced against him that denies the Conversion of the whole Substance of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, the Species of Bread and Wine only remaining. *Now a Controversie hath been started in the* Church *of* Rome, *what is to be understood by* Species, *whether* real Accidents *or only* Appearances.

Some of the Church *of* Rome *who have had a Tast of the New Philosophy, reject any* real Accidents, *and yet declare* Transubstantiation *to be a matter of Faith, and go about to explain the Notion of it in another manner.*

Maignan *Philosophia Sacra.* Part 2. Append. 5.

Among these one Emanuel Maignan, *a Professor of Divinity at* Tholouse, *hath at large undertaken this matter. The Method he takes is this.*

(1.) *He grants, that nothing remains of the Bread after Consecration, but that whereby it was an Object of Sense; because that which is really the Being of one thing cannot be the Being of another. And he confesses that the* Modus *as to the* not being *of the* Substance *after Consecration, is determin'd by the* Councils *of* Constance *and* Trent.

(2.) *He asserts, that real Accidents, supposing them separable from the Substance, are not that whereby the Elements are made the Objects of Sense; because they do not make the Conjunction between the Object and the Faculty.*

(3.) *Since he denies, that Accidents have any real Being distinct from the Substance they are in, he grants, that it is as much a matter of Faith, that there are no real Accidents after Consecration, as that there is no real Substance; and he brings the Authorities of the Councils of* Lateran, Florence *and* Trent *to prove it.*

(4.) *As*

(4.) *As the Subſtance did by Divine Concourſe ſo Act upon the Senſes before, as to make it be an Object of Senſe; ſo after Conſecration, God by his immediate Act makes the ſame* Appearances, *although the Subſtance be gone. And this, he ſaith, is the effect of this Miraculous Converſion, which is concealed from our Senſes, by God's immediate cauſing the very ſame Appearances, which came before from the Subſtance. Which Appearances, he ſaith, are the* Species *mention'd by the* Council *of* Trent; *and other elder Councils and Fathers.*

Againſt this new Hypotheſis, *a famous* Jeſuit, Theophilus Raynaudus, *oppoſed himſelf with great vehemency; and urged theſe Arguments againſt it.*

(1.) *That it overthrows the very Nature of a Sacrament, leaving no external viſible ſign; but a perpetual illuſion of the Senſes, in ſuch a manner, that the Error of one cannot be corrected by another.*

(2.) *That it overthrows the Deſign of the Sacrament, which is to be true and proper Food.* My Fleſh is meat indeed, *&c.* John 6. *Which, he ſaith, is to be underſtood of the Sacrament, as well as of the Body of Chriſt, and therefore cannot agree with an imaginary appearance.*

(3.) *It is not conſiſtent with the* Accidents *which befall the Sacramental* Species, *as* to be trod under foot, to be caſt into indecent places, to be devoured by Brutes, to be Putrified, *&c.* *If the Body of Chriſt withdraws, there muſt be ſomething beyond mere* Appearances.

(4.) *He makes this Doctrine to be* Heretical, *becauſe the* Council *of* Conſtance *condemned it as an* Heretical Propoſition, *to affirm,* that in the Euchariſt Accidents do not remain without their Subject; *and becauſe the* Council *of* Trent *uſes the Word* Species *in the Senſe*

then generally received, and ſo it ſignified the ſame with Accidents. *Which, ſaith he, farther appears, becauſe the* Council *ſpeaks of the* Species remaining ; *but if there be no real Accidents, the Species doth not remain in the Object ; but a new Appearance is produced. And it ſeems moſt reaſonable to interpret the Language of the Council according to the general Senſe wherein the Words were underſtood at that time.*

VII. *What things were diſputed and oppoſed by ſome in the* Council, *without being cenſured for it, although they were afterwards decreed by a* Major Party, *yet cannot be ſaid to have been there received by a* Catholick Tradition. *Becauſe* Matters *of* Faith *which have been univerſally received in the* Church, *can never be ſuppoſed to be conteſted in a* Council *without* Cenſure ; *but if it appears that there were Heats and warm Debates among the Parties in the* Council *it ſelf, and both think they ſpeak the Senſe of the* Catholick Church ; *then we muſt either allow that there was then no known* Catholick Tradition *about thoſe matters, or that the Divines of the* Church *of* Rome *aſſembled in* Council *did not underſtand what it was. And whát happens to be decreed by a* Majority, *can never be concluded from thence to have been the* Tradition *before, becauſe there was a different Senſe of others concerning it. And ſince in a diviſion, a ſingle Perſon may make a* Majority, *it will be very hard to believe, that he carries* Infallibility *and* Catholick Tradition *along with him.*

But I think it Reaſonable in the enquiry after Catholick Tradition *to take notice of the different Opinions in the* Council ; *and among the* School-men *before it ; and not only to obſerve, what was the Senſe of the* Roman Church,

Church, *but of the* Eaſtern Churches *too ; and where the matter requires it, to go through the ſeveral* Ages *of the Church up to the* Apoſtolical Times ; *that I may effectually prove, that in the main Points in Controverſie between us, which are eſtabliſhed by the* Council *of* Trent, *there cannot be produced any* Catholick *and* Apoſtolical Tradition *for them.*

THE

THE CONTENTS.

Page

Some Poſtulata *about* Catholick Tradition, 1.

I. *Point examined about* **Traditions being a Rule of Faith equal with Scriptures,** 2.

The Senſe of the Council *of* Trent *concerning it,* 3.

No Catholick Tradition for it ſhew'd from the differences about it in the Council, 4.

From the Divines of the Roman *Church for ſome Ages before the Council,* 5.

The Teſtimonies of the Canon Law againſt it, 17.

Of the Ancient Offices of the Roman *Church,* 20.

Of the Fathers, 21.

The firſt ſtep of Traditions *being ſet up as a* Rule *by the ſecond Council of* Nice, 26.

Not receiv'd as a Rule of Faith *till after the Council of* Lateran *under* Innocent *III.* 27.

The occaſion of it ſet down from new Points of Faith there determin'd, 28.

Never eſtabliſhed for a Rule *till the Council of* Trent, 29.

II. **About the Canon of Scripture defined by the Council of** Trent, 30.

The Senſe of the Council, ibid.

The

The difference there about it, 31.
A constant Tradition against it in the Eastern *Church,* 33.
No Catholick Tradition for it in the Western *Church,* 35.
The several steps as to the Alteration of the Canon set down, 38.
The different meaning of Apocryphal *Writings,* 40.

III. About the free use of the Scripture in the vulgar Language ppohibited by the Council of Trent, 43.
The Sense of the Council, ibid.
No Catholick Tradition about this proved from the Writers of the Roman *Church,* 44.
The General Consent of the Catholick Church against it proved from the Ancient Translations into Vulgar Languages, 46.
The first Occasion of the Scriptures being in an unknown Language, 52.
The first prohibition by Gregory *VII.* 56.
Continued by the Inquisition after Innocent *III.* 58.

IV. About the Merit of Good Works, 59.
The Sense of true Merit cleared from the Divines of the Church of Rome, ibid.
No Catholick Tradition for it proved from ancient Offices, 61.
From Provincial Councils and eminent Divines in several Ages before the Council of Trent, 63.
The several steps how the Doctrine of Merit came in, 68.

V. Of the number of Sacraments, 74.
An appeal to Tradition *for* 500. *years for* Seven Sacraments

craments *examin'd and disprov'd*, 75.
As to Chrism, 77.
As to Orders, 80.
As to Penance, 85.
As to Extreme-Unction, 92.
As to Matrimony, 97.
The sense of the Greek Church *about the* Seven Sacraments, 102.
The Sense of other Eastern Churches, 110.
When the number of Seven Sacraments *came first in*, 112.
The particular occasions of them, 116.

VI. Of Auricular Confession, 117.
No Catholick Tradition *confessed by their own Writers*, 118.
The several steps and Occasions of introducing it, at large set down, 127.
The difference between the ancient Discipline and Modern Confession, 128.
Of voluntary Confession, 133.
Of the Penitentiaries *Office*, 135.
Publick Discipline not taken away at Constantinople *when the Penitentiary was removed*, 136.
Proved from S. Chrysostom, 140.
Publick Penance for publick Sins, 142.
Private Confession came in upon the decay of the Ancient Discipline, 144.

THE

THE
Council of Trent
EXAMINED
AND
DISPROVED, &c.

THere are Two things deſigned by me in this Treatiſe,

1. To ſhew that there is no ſuch thing as univerſal Tradition for the main Points in Controverſie between us and the Church of *Rome*, as they are determined by the Council of *Trent*.

2. To give an Account by what Steps and Degrees, and on what Occaſion thoſe Doctrines and Practices came into the Church.

But before I come to particulars, I ſhall lay down ſome reaſonable *Poſtulata*.

1. That a *Catholick Tradition* muſt be univerſally received among the ſound Members of the Catholick Church.

2. That the force of Tradition lies in the Certainty of Conveyance of Matters of Faith from the Apoſtolical Times. For no New Doctrines being pretended to, there

can be no Matter of Faith in any Age of the Church, but what was ſo in the precedent and ſo up to the Apoſtles times.

3. That it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe the Divines of the Catholick Church to be ignorant, what was in their own time received for *Catholick Tradition.* For, if it be ſo hard for others to miſtake it, it will be much more ſo for thoſe whoſe buſineſs is to enquire into, and to deliver Matters of Faith.

Theſe things premiſed, I now enter upon the Points themſelves; and I begin with,

I. Traditions being a Rule of Faith equal with Scriptures.

This is declared by the Council of *Trent*, as the Groundwork of their Proceedings.

Necnon Traditiones ipſas tum ad fidem tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Chriſto vel à Spiritu ſancto dictatas & continuâ ſucceſſione in Eccleſia Catholica conſervatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ ſuſcipit & veneratur.

The words are Seſſ. 4. *That the Council receives Traditions both as to Faith and manners, either delivered by Chriſt himſelf with his own mouth, or dictated by the Holy Ghoſt, and preſerved in the Catholick Church by a continual Succeſſion with equal Piety of Affection and Reverence as the Proofs of holy Scripture.*

Where the Council firſt ſuppoſes *there are ſuch Traditions from Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt diſtinct from Scripture which relate to Faith*; and then it declares *equal Reſpect and Veneration due to them.* No one queſtions but the Word of Chriſt and Dictates of the Holy Ghoſt deſerve equal Reſpect, howſoever conveyed to us; But the Point is, whether there was a *Catholick Tradition* before this time for

for an unwritten Word, as a Foundation of Faith, together with the written Word.

1. It is therefore impertinent here to talk of a *Tradition before the written Word*; for our Debate is concerning both being joined together to make a perfect Rule of Faith: and yet this is one of the common Pleas on behalf of Tradition.

2. It is likewise impertinent to talk of that Tradition whereby we do receive the written Word. For the Council first supposes the written Word to be received and embraced as the Word of God, before it mentions the unwritten Word; and therefore, it cannot be understood concerning that Tradition whereby we receive the Scriptures. And the Council affirms, *That the Truth of the Gospel is contained partly in Books that are written, and partly in unwritten Traditions.* By the Truth of the Gospel they cannot mean the Scriptures being the Word of God, but that the word was contained partly in Scripture and partly in Tradition; and it is therefore impertinent to urge the Tradition for Scripture to prove Tradition to be part of the Rule of Faith, as it is here owned by the Council of *Trent*.

3. The Council doth not here speak of a Traditionary sense of Scripture, but of a distinct Rule of Faith from the Scripture. For of that it speaks afterwards in the Decree about the use of the Scripture; where it saith, *no man ought to interpret Scripture against the Sense of the Church to whom it belongs to judge of the true Sense and Meaning of Scripture, nor against the unanimous Consent of the Fathers.* Whereby it is evident, the Council is not to be understood of any Consequences drawn out of Scripture concerning things not expresly contained in it; but it clearly means an unwritten Word distinct from the written, and not contained in it, which, together with

that, makes up a Complete Rule of Faith. This being the true ſenſe of the Council, I now ſhew that there was no *Catholick Tradition* for it.

Which I ſhall prove by theſe ſteps:

1. From the Proceedings of the Council it ſelf.
2. From the Teſtimony of the Divines of that Church before the Council for ſeveral Centuries.
3. From the Canon Law received and allowed in the Church of *Rome*.
4. From the ancient Offices uſed in that Church.
5. From the Teſtimony of the Fathers.

1. From the Proceedings of the Council about this matter.

By the *Poſtulata* it appears, that the *Catholick Tradition* is ſuch as muſt be known by the ſound members of the Church, and eſpecially of the Divines in it. But it appears by the moſt allowed Hiſtories of that Council, this Rule of Faith was not ſo received there. For Cardinal *Pallavicini* tells us that it was warmly debated and canvaſſed even by the Biſhops themſelves. The Biſhop of *Fano* (*Bertanus*) urged againſt it, *that God had not given equal firmneſs to Tradition as he had done to Scripture, ſince ſeveral Traditions had failed.* But the Biſhop of *Bitonto* (*Muſſus*) oppoſed him and ſaid, *Though all Truths were not to be equally regarded, yet every word of God ought, and Traditions as well as Scripture were the word of God, and the firſt Principles of Faith; and the greater part of the Council followed him.* It ſeems then there was a diviſion in the Council about it; but how could that be if there were a Catholick Tradition about this Rule of Faith? Could the Biſhops of the Catholick Church, when aſſembled in Council to determine Matters of Faith, be

Hiſt. Concil. Trident. l. 6. c. 14. n. 3.

be no better agreed about the Rule of Faith; and yet must we believe there was at that time a known Catholick Tradition about it, and that it was impossible they should err about such a Tradition? Nay farther, the same Authour tells us, that although this Bishop had gained the greatest part of the Council to him, yet his own heart misgave him, and in the next Congregation himself proposed, that instead of *equal* it might be put a *like Veneration*; and yet we must believe there was a Catholick Tradition for an Equal Veneration to Scripture and Tradition. *But the Bishop of* Chioza, (Naclantus) he saith, *inveighed more bitterly against this Equality*, and in the face of the Council *charged the Doctrine with Impiety*; and he would not allow any Divine Inspiration to Tradition, but that they were to be considered onely as Laws of the Church. It's true, he saith he professed to consent to the Decree afterwards, but withall he tells us, that he was brought under the Inquisition not long after, upon suspicion of Heresie; which shews they were not well satisfied with his submission. We are extremely beholden to Cardinal *Pallavicini* for his Information in these matters, which are past over too jejunely by *F. Paul.* N. 4.

2. I proceed to the Testimony of the Divines of the Roman Church before the Council of *Trent*. It is observed by some of them, that when the Fathers appealed to the Tradition of the Church in any controverted Point of Faith, they made their Appeal to those who wrote before the Controversie was started; as S. *Augustin* did against the *Pelagians*, *&c.* This is a reasonable Method of proceeding, in case Tradition be a Rule of Faith: and therefore must be so even in this point, whether Tradition be such a Rule or not. For the Divines who wrote before could not be ignorant of the Rule of Faith they received among themselves. Aug. *l.* 2. *c.* Julian.

Gabriel.

Gabriel Biel lived in the latter end of the 15th Century, and he affirms, *that the Scripture alone teaches all things neceſſary to ſalvation*; and he inſtances *in the things to be done and to be avoided, to be loved and to be deſpiſed, to be believed and to be hoped for.* And again, *that the Will of God is to be underſtood by the Scriptures, and by them alone we know the whole Will of God.* If the whole Will of God were to be known by the Scripture, how could part of it be preſerved in an unwritten Tradition? And if this were then part of the Rule of Faith, how could ſuch a Man, who was Profeſſour of Divinity at *Tubing* be ignorant of it? I know he ſaith he took the main of his Book from the Lectures of *Eggelingus*, in the Cathedral Church at *Mentz*; but this adds greater ſtrength to the Argument, ſince it appears hereby that this Doctrine was not confined to the Schools, but openly delivered in one of the moſt famous Churches of *Germany*.

Et cætera noſtræ ſaluti neceſſaria, quæ omnia ſola docet ſacra Scriptura. Lection. in Canon. Miſſæ 71.

Hæc autem in ſacris Scripturis diſcuntur, per quas ſolas plenam intelligere poſſumus Dei voluntatem. ib.

Cajetan died not above 12 Years before the Council, who agrees with this Doctrine of *Biel* or *Eggelingus* (and he was accounted the *Oracle* of his time for Divinity) for he affirms *that the Scripture gives ſuch a perfection to a Man of God (or one that devoutly ſerves him) that thereby he is accompliſhed for every good Work*; How can this be, if there be another Rule of Faith quite diſtinct from the Written Word?

Ecce quo tendit utilitas divinæ Scripturæ ad perfectionem hominis Dei (hoc eſt qui totum ſeipſum Deo dat) perfectionem inquam talem ut ſit perfectus ad omne bonum exercendum. In 2. ad Tim. 3. 16.

Bellarmin indeed grants, *that all things which are ſimply neceſſary to the Salvation of all, are plainly contained in Scripture*, by which he yields, that the *Scripture* alone is the *Rule* of *Faith* as to neceſſary points; and he calls

calls the Scripture *the certain and ſtable Rule of Faith*, yea *the moſt certain and moſt ſecure Rule*. If there be then any other, it muſt be *leſs certain* and about points *not neceſſary* to Salvation; *i. e.* it muſt be a Rule where there is no need of a Rule. For if Mens Salvation be ſufficiently provided for, by the Written Rule; and the Divine Revelation, be in Order to mens Salvation, what need any other Revelation to the Church, beſides what is Written?

Dico illa omnia Scripta eſſe ab Apoſtolis quæ ſunt omnibus neceſſaria, & quæ ipſi palam omnibus vulgò prædicaverunt. Bellarm. *de verbo Dei. l.* 4. *c.* 11.

Illud imprimis ſtatuendum erit Propheticos & Apoſtolicos libros juxta mentem Eccleſiæ Catholicæ verum eſſe verbum Dei & certam ac ſtabilem Regulam fidei. Id. l. 1. *c.* 1.

At ſacris Scripturis quæ Propheticis & Apoſtolicis literis continentur, nihil eſt notius, nihil certius. Id. c. 2.

Quare cum Sacra Scriptura Regula credendi certiſſima tutiſſimáque ſit. Ibid.

He aſſerts farther, *that nothing is* de fide, *but what God hath revealed to the Prophets and Apoſtles, or is deduced from thence.* This he brings to prove *that whatſoever was received as a matter of Faith in the Church, which is not found in Scripture muſt have come from an Apoſtolical Tradition.* But if it be *neceſſary to Salvation*, according to his own Conceſſion it muſt be written; and if it be not, how comes it to be received as a matter of Faith? unleſs it be firſt proved, that it is neceſſary to Salvation to receive an unwritten Rule of Faith, as well as a written? For, either it muſt be neceſſary on its own Account, and then he ſaith it muſt be written; and if not, then it can be no otherwiſe neceſſary than becauſe it is to be believed on the Account of a Rule, which makes it neceſſary. And conſequently that Rule muſt be firſt proved to be a neceſſary Article of Faith: Which *Bellarmin* hath no where done; but onely ſets down Rules about knowing true Apoſtolical Traditions from others in matters of Faith, wherein he wiſely ſuppoſes that which he was to prove. L. 4. c. 9.

And

And the true Occaſion of ſetting up this new Rule of Faith is intimated by *Bellarmin* himſelf in his firſt Rule of judging true Apoſtolical Traditions. Which is, *when the Church believes any thing as a Doctrine of Faith which is not in Scripture*, then ſaith he, *we muſt judge it to be an Apoſtolical Tradition.* Why ſo? *Otherwiſe the Church muſt have erred in taking that for a matter of Faith which was not.* And this is the great *Secret* about this *New Rule of Faith*; they ſaw plainly ſeveral things were impoſed on the Faith of Chriſtians, which could not be proved from *Scripture*; and they muſt not yield they had once miſtaken, and therefore this New, Additional Leſs certain Rule for *unneceſſary Points* muſt be advanced, although they wanted *Tradition* among themſelves to prove *Tradition a Rule of Faith*, which I ſhall now farther make appear from their own *School Divines* before the Council of *Trent*.

We are to obſerve among them what thoſe are which they ſtrictly call *Theological Truths*, and by them we ſhall judge, what they made *the Rule of Faith*. For, they do not make a bare *Revelation* to any Perſon a ſufficient Ground for Faith; but they ſay * *the Revelation muſt be publick, and deſigned for the general Benefit of the Church*; and ſo *Aquinas* determines † *that our Faith reſts onely upon the Revelations made to the Prophets and Apoſtles*; *and Theological Truths* are ſuch as are immediately deduced from *the Principles of Faith*, i.e. *from publick Divine Revelations* owned and received by the Church. The modern School men, || who follow the Council of *Trent* make *Theological Truths to be deduced from the unwritten as well as the Written word*; or elſe they would not ſpeak conſonantly to their own Doctrine. And therefore if thoſe before them deduce *Theological Truths* onely from the Written Word, then it will follow that they did not hold

* Et quantum ad ea quæ proponantur omnibus credenda quæ pertinent ad fidem. 2. 2. q. 171. prol.

† 1. q. 1. a. 5.

|| Melch. Can. l. 12. c. 3.

hold the *unwritten Word* to *be a Rule of Faith.*

Marsilius ab Inghen was first Professor of Divinity of *Heidelberg* (at the latter end of the 15*th Century* saith *Bellarmin*, but *Trithemius* saith the 14*th*) and he determines, *that a Theological Proposition is that which is positively asserted in Scripture or deduced from thence by good Consequence*; *and that a Theological Truth strictly taken is the Truth of an Article of Faith, or something expressed in the Bible, or deduced from thence.* He mentions *Apostolical Traditions* afterwards, and joins them with *Ecclesiastical Histories and Martyrologies.* So far was he from supposing them to be part of the *Rule of Faith.* Marsil. *in* 4. *lib. Sentent. l.* 1. *Proæm. q.* 2. *art.* 2.

In the beginning of the 15*th* Century lived *Petrus de Alliaco*, one as famous for his skill in Divinity, as for his Dignity in the Church, He saith, *that Theological Discourse is founded on Scripture, and a Theological Proof must be drawn from thence; that Theological Principles are the Truths contained in the Canon of Scripture; and Conclusions are such as are drawn out of what is contained in Scripture.* So that he not onely makes the *Scripture* the *Foundation* of *Faith*, but of all sorts of *true Reasoning* about it. He knew nothing of Cardinal *Palavicini's two first Principles of Faith.* Per. de Alliaco *in Sent. l.* 1. *q.* 1. *a.* 3.

To the same purpose speaks *Gregorius Ariminensis*, about the middle of the 14*th* Century he saith, *all Theological Discourse is grounded on Scripture and the Consequences from it*; which he not onely proves from Testimony, but *ex communi omnium conceptione, from the general Consent of Christians.* For, saith he, *all are agreed that then a thing is proved Theologically, when it is proved from the Words of Scripture.* So that here we have plain *Tradition*, against *Traditions being a distinct Rule of Faith*, and this delivered by the General of an Order in the Church of *Rome.* He affirms that the Principles of Theo- Greg. Arimin. *q.* 1. *a.* 2.

logy, are no other than the Truths contained in *the Canon of Scripture*; and that the *Resolution* of all *Theological Discourse* is into them; and that there can be no *Theological Conclusion*, but what is drawn from *Scripture*.

Durand. *Prol.* *Q.* 5. *n.* 9. In the former part of that Century lived *Durandus*, he gives a threefold Sense of *Theology*. 1. *For a habit whereby we assent to those things which are contained in Scripture, as they are there delivered.* 2. *For a habit whereby those things are defended and declared which are* *a.* 13. *delivered in Scripture.* 3. *For a habit of those things which are deduced out of Articles of Faith; and so it is* *n.* 21. *all one with the holy Scripture.*

L. 3. *Dist.* 25. *q.* 2. And in another place he affirms, *that all Truth is contained in the Holy Scripture at large; but for the People's Conveniency the necessary Points are summed up in the Apostles Creed.*

In his *Preface* before his Book on the *Sentences* he highly commends *the Scriptures for their Dignity, their Usefulness, their Certainty, their Depth*; and after all concludes, *that in matters of Faith men ought to speak agreeably to the Scriptures; and whosoever doth not, breaks the Rule of the Scriptures*, which he calls *the Measure of our Faith*. What *Tradition* did appear then for another Rule of Faith in the 14*th Century*?

But before I proceed higher I shall shew the Consent of others with these School Divines in the three last *Centuries* before the *Council of Trent*. In the middle of the 15*th* lived *Nicholaus Panormitanus*, one of mighty Reputation for his skill in the *Canon Law*. In the Ch *Significâsti prima.* 1. *de Electione*, debating the Authority of *Pope and Council*, he saith, *If the Pope hath better Reason his Authority is greater than the Councils; and if any private person in matters of Faith hath*

Nam in concernentibus fidem etiam dictum unius privati esset præferendum dicto Papæ si ille moveretur melioribus rationibus novi & veteris Testamenti quàm Papa.

hath better Reaſon out of Scripture than the Pope, his ſaying is to be preferred above the Pope's. Which words do plainly ſhew, that the *Scripture* was then looked on as the *onely Rule of Faith*; or elſe no Man's grounding himſelf on *Scripture* could make his Doctrine to be preferred before the Pope's; who might alledge *Tradition* againſt him, and if that were an equal Rule of Faith, the Doctrine of one Rule could not be preferred before the other.

At the ſame time lived *Toſtatus* the famous Biſhop of *Avila*, one of infinite Induſtry and great Judgment, and therefore could not be miſtaken in the *Rule of Faith.* In his Preface on *Geneſis* he ſaith, *that there muſt be a Rule for our underſtandings to be regulated by, and that Rule muſt be moſt certain; that Divine Faith is the moſt certain; and that is contained in Scripture, and therefore we muſt regulate our underſtandings thereby. And this he makes to be the meaſure of Truth and Falſhood.* If he knew any other *Rule* of *Faith* beſides the *Scriptures*, he would have mentioned it in this place; and not have directed Men onely to them, as the *exact meaſure of Truth and Falſhood.*

Cùm ergo in omni veritate veritas divina ſit certior & immutabilior, ergo omnes aliæ debent regulari per illam, & in quantum conformantur illi ſunt veræ; in quantum autem deviant ab illa, deviant à natura veritatis. Sacra autem Scriptura veritas divina eſt, ideo judicium noſtrum debemus regulare per illam applicando ad eam, &c. Toſtat. *in Ep.* Hieron. *c. 6. p. 28. D.*

In the beginning of this *Century Thomas Walden* (Confeſſor to our *Henry* 5th, ſaith *Trithemius,*) diſputed ſharply againſt *Wickliff*; but he durſt not ſet up the Churches *Authority* or *Tradition equal with the Scriptures.* For when he mentions *Tradition* after *Scriptures*, he utterly *diſclaims any ſuch thought as that of Equality between them*; but he deſires a due diſtance may be kept between *Canonical Scripture* and *Eccleſiaſtical Authority* or *Tradition.* In the firſt place he ſaith, *we ought to believe the holy Scriptures*; then

Non quod in Auctoritate æquantur, abſit; ſed ſequantur. Non quidem in ſubſidium Auctoritatis Canonicæ, ſed in admonitionem poſterorum, l. 2. Art. 2. c. 22.

c. 28. *the Definitions and Cuſtoms of the Catholick Church*; but he more fully explains himſelf in another place, where

c. 27. he plainly aſſerts, *that nothing elſe is to be received by ſuch Faith as the Scripture and Chriſt's ſymbolical Church; but for all other Authorities, the loweſt degree is that of Catholick Tradition, the next of the Biſhops, eſpecially of the Apoſtolical Churches, and the Roman in the firſt place; and above all theſe he places that of a General Council*; but when he hath ſo done, he ſaith, *all theſe Authorities are to be regarded but as the Inſtructions of Elders, and Admonitions of Fathers.* So that the chief Oppoſers of *Wickliff* had not yet found out this *new Rule of Faith.*

Joh. Gerſon. *Exam. Doctr. p.* 540. *Part.* 1. *Conſ.* 5. Much about the ſame time lived *Joh. Gerſon*, whom Cardinal *Zabarella declared, in the Council of* Conſtance, *to be the greateſt Divine of his time*, and therefore could not be ignorant of the *true Rule of Faith.* He agrees with *Panormitan* in this, *that if a man be well ſkilled in Scriptures, his Doctrine deſerves more to be regarded than the Pope's Declaration; for*, ſaith he, *the Goſpel is more to be believed than the Pope, and if ſuch a one teaches a Doctrine to be contained in Scripture, which the Pope either knows not or miſtakes, it is plain whoſe Judgment is to be preferred.* Nay, he goes farther, *that if in a General Council he finds the Majority incline to that part which is contrary to Scripture, he is bound to oppoſe it*, and he inſtances in *Hilary.* And he ſhews, *that ſince the Canon of Scripture received by the Church, no Authority of the Church is to be*

Conſ. 6. *equalled to it.* He allows *a Judgment* of *Diſcretion* in private perſons, and a *Certainty of the literal Senſe* of *Scripture* attainable thereby. He makes *the Scripture the onely ſtanding infallible Rule of Faith for the whole Church to the end of the world. And whatever Doctrine is not agreeable thereto, is to be rejected either*

Nihil audendum dicere de divinis niſi quæ nobis à Sacra Scriptura tradita ſunt. Cujus ratio eſt, quoniam Scriptura nobis tradita eſt tanquam Regula ſufficiens & infallibilis, pro Regimine totius Eccleſiaſti-

as

as Heretical, ſuſpicious, or impertinent to Religion. If the Council of *Trent* had gone by this *Rule*, we had never heard of the Creed of *Pius* IV.

gionem prorſus eſt habenda.

ci corporis & membrorum uſque in finem ſeculi. Eſt igitur talis Ars, talis regula, vel exemplar, cui ſe non conformans alia Doctrina, vel abjicienda eſt ut hæreticalis, aut ſuſpecta, aut impertinens ad Reli- Exam. Doctr. Part. 2. Conſid. 1.

In the beginning of the 14th Century lived *Nicolaus de Lyra*, who parallels *the Scriptures in matters of Faith* with *Firſt-principles in Sciences*; for *as other Truths are tried in them by their reduction to Firſt-principles, ſo in matters of Faith by their reduction to Canonical Scriptures, which are of divine Revelation, which is impoſſible to be falſe.* If he had known any other Principles which would have made Faith impoſſible to be falſe, he would never have ſpoken thus of Scripture alone. But to return to the School Divines. Lyra, *Præfat. ad lib.* Toſiæ.

About the ſame time lived *Joh. Duns Scotus*, the head of a School, famous for Subtilty; He affirms, *that the holy Scripture doth ſufficiently contain all matters neceſſary to ſalvation; becauſe by it we know what we are to believe, hope for, and practiſe.* And after he hath enlarged upon them, he concludes in theſe words, *patet quod Scriptura ſacra ſufficienter continet Doctrinam neceſſariam viatori.* If this be underſtood onely of *Points ſimply neceſſary*, then however it proves, that all ſuch things neceſſary to Salvation are therein contained; and no man is bound to enquire after unneceſſary Points. How then can it be neceſſary to embrace another Rule of Faith, when all things neceſſary to Salvation are ſufficiently contained in Scripture? Scot. *in Sentent. Prolog. Q. 2. n. 14.*

But *Thomas Aquinas* is more expreſs in this matter; For he ſaith, *that thoſe things which depend on the Will of God, and are above any deſert of ours, can*

Ea enim quæ ex ſola Dei voluntate ſupra omne debitum Creaturæ, nobis innoteſcere non poſſunt, niſi quatenus in ſacra Scriptura traduntur, per quam Divina voluntas nobis innoteſcit. 3. q. 1 a. 3. in C.

be

be known no otherways by us, than as they are delivered in Scriptures by the Will of God, which is made known to us.

This is ſo remarkable a Paſſage, that *Suarez* could not let it eſcape without corrupting it; for inſtead of *Scripture* he makes him to ſpeak of Divine Revelation in general, *viz.* under *Scripture he comprehends all*; that is, under the *written Word* he means the *unwritten*. If he had meant ſo, he was able to have expreſſed his own mind more plainly; and *Cajetan* apprehended no ſuch meaning in his words. But this is a matter of ſo great conſequence, that I ſhall prove from other paſſages in him, that he aſſerted the ſame Doctrine, *viz. That the Scripture was the onely Rule of Faith.*

Suarez, *in* 3. *p.* 117.

1. He makes *no Proofs of matters of Faith to be ſufficient but ſuch as are deduced from Scripture; and all other Arguments from Authority to be onely probable; nay although ſuch Perſons had particular Revelations.* How can this be conſiſtent with another Rule of Faith diſtinct from *Scripture*? For if he had owned any ſuch, he muſt have deduced neceſſary Arguments from thence, as well as from Canonical Scriptures. But if all other Authorities be onely *probable*, then they cannot make any thing neceſſary to be believed.

Authoritatibus autem Canonicæ Scripturæ utitur propriè ex neceſſitate argumentando; autoritatibus autem aliorum Doctorum Eccleſiæ quaſi arguendo ex propriis ſed probabiliter. Inititur enim fides noſtra Revelationi Apoſtolis & Prophetis factæ, qui Canonicos libros ſcripſerunt, non autem Revelationi ſi qua fuit aliis Doctoribus facta. 1. *q.* 1. *a.* 8. *ad* 2.

2. He affirms, *that to thoſe who receive the Scriptures we are to prove nothing but by the Scriptures, as matter of Faith.* For by *Authorities* he means nothing but the *Scriptures*; as appears by the former place, and by what follows, where he mentions the *Canon of Scripture* expreſſly.

Quæ igitur fidei ſunt non ſunt tentanda probari niſi per Autoritates his qui Autoritates ſuſcipiunt. 1. *q.* 32. *a.* 1. *c.*

Si autem ad veritatem eloquiorum ſc. ſacrorum reſpicit, hoc & nos Canone utimur. Ib.

3. He

3. He asserts that *the Articles of the Creed are all contained in Scripture, and are drawn out of Scripture, and put together by the Church onely for the Ease of the People.* From hence it neneſſarily follows that the Reaſon of believing the *Articles* of the *Creed*, is to be taken from the *written Word* and not from any *unwritten Tradition.* For elſe he needed not to have been ſo careſull to ſhew, that they were all taken out of Scripture.

Dicendum quod veritas fidei in Sacra Scriptura diffusè continetur—ideò fuit necessarium ut ex sententiis Sacræ Scripturæ aliquid manifestum summatim colligeretur, quod proponeretur omnibus ad credendum; quod quidem non est additum Sacræ Scripturæ, sed potius ex Sacra Scriptura sumptum. 2. 2. q. 1. a. 9. ad primum.

4. He diſtinguiſheth the Matters of Faith in *Scripture, ſome to be believed for themſelves,* which he calls *prima Credibilia;* theſe he ſaith *every one is bound explicitly to believe; but for other things he is bound onely implicitly, or in a preparation of mind, to believe whatever is contained in Scripture; and then onely is he bound to believe explicitly when it is made clear to him to be contained in the Doctrine of Faith.* Which words muſt imply the *Scripture* to be the onely Rule of Faith; For otherwiſe *implicit Faith,* muſt relate to whatever is proved to be an *unwritten Word.*

Quantum ad prima Credibilia, quæ sunt Articuli fidei, tenetur homo explicitè credere, sicut & tenetur habere fidem. Quantum autem ad alia credibilia non tenetur homo explicitè credere, sed solum implicitè, vel in præparatione animi in quantum paratus est credere quicquid Scriptura continet; sed tunc solum hujusmodi tenetur explicitè credere, quando hoc ei constiterit in Doctrina fidei contineri. 2. 2. q. 2. a 5. c.

From all this it appears that *Aquinas* knew nothing of a *Traditional Rule of Faith;* although he lived after the *Lateran Council* A. D. 1215. being born about nine years after it.

And *Bonaventure,* who died the ſame year with him, affirms, *that nothing was to be ſaid,* (about Matters of Faith) *but what is made clear out of the holy Scriptures.*

Et nihil nobis dicendum est, præter ea quæ nobis ex Sacris Eloquiis claret. Bonav. *in* 3 *Sent. Dist.* 2. *Art.* 2. *q.* 2.

Not

Not long after them lived *Henricus Gandavenſis*; and he delivers theſe things which are very material to our purpoſe.

1. *That the Reaſon why we believe the Guides of the Church ſince the Apoſtles, who work no Miracles, is, becauſe they preach nothing but what they have left in their moſt certain Writings, which are delivered down to us pure and uncorrupt by an univerſal conſent of all that ſucceeded to our times.* Where we ſee he makes the Scriptures to be the onely Certain Rule, and that we are to judge of all other Doctrines by them.

Quod autem credimus poſterioribus circa quos non apparent virtutes divinæ, hoc eſt, quia non prædicant alia quàm quæ illi in ſcriptis certiſſimis reliquêrunt, quæ conſtat per medios in nullo fuiſſe viciata ex conſenſione concordi in eis omnium ſuccedentium uſque ad tempora noſtra. Hen. Gandav. *Sum. Art.* 9. *q.* 3 *n.* 13. 2.

2. *That Truth is more certainly preſerved in Scripture than in the Church; becauſe that is fixed and immutable, and men are variable, ſo that multitudes of them may depart from the Faith, either through Errour or Malice; but the true Church will always remain in ſome righteous perſons.* How then can *Tradition* be a *Rule of Faith* equal with Scriptures, which depends upon the Teſtimony of Perſons who are ſo very fallible?

Quia veritas ipſa in Scriptura immobiliter & impermutabiliter ſemper cuſtoditur. — In perſonis autem Eccleſiæ mutabilis eſt & variabilis ut diſſentire fidei poſſit multitudo illorum, & vel per errorem, vel per malitiam à fide diſcedere liceat; ſemper Eccleſia in aliquibus juſtus ſtabit. Art. 8. *q.* 1. *n.* 5.

I might carry this way of Teſtimony on higher ſtill, as when *Richardus de S. Victore* ſaith, in the thirteenth Century, *that every Truth is ſuſpected by him, which is not confirmed by Holy Scripture*; but inſtead of that I ſhall now proceed to the *Canon Law*, as having more Authority than particular Teſtimonies.

Suſpecta eſt mihi omnis veritas, quam non confirmat Scripturarum Auctoritas. Rich. *de S.* Victore, *De Præpar. Animi ad Contempl. Part.* 1. *c.* 81.

As

3. As to the *Canon Law* collected by *Gratian*, I do not insist upon its *Confirmation* by *Eugenius*, but upon its *universal Reception* in the *Church* of *Rome*. And from thence I shall evidently prove that *Tradition* was not allowed to be a *Rule of Faith equal with the Scriptures.*

Dist. 9. *c.* 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10. *The Authority and Infallibility of the holy Scripture is asserted above all other Writings whatsoever; for all other Writings are to be examined, and men are to judge of them as they see cause.*

Now *Bellarmin* tells us, *that the unwritten Word is so called, not that it always continues unwritten, but that it was so by the first Authour of it.* So that the *unwritten Word* doth not depend on mere *Oral Tradition*, according to him, but it may be found in *the Writers of the Church*; but the Canon Law expresly excludes *all other Writings*, let them contain what they will, from being admitted to any Competition with *Canonical Scripture*; and therefore according to that, no part of the Rule of Faith was contained in any other than Canonical Scriptures.

De verbo Dei l. 4. c. 2.

c. 12.

Dist. 37. *c. Relatum*, A man is supposed to *have an entire and firm Rule of Faith in the Scriptures.*

Cùm enim ex divinis Scripturis integram quis & firmam Regulam veritatis susceperit.

Caus. 8. *q.* 1. *c. Nec sufficere, The Scriptures are said to be the onely Rule both of Faith and Life.*

Quibus sacris literis unica est credendi pariter & vivendi Regula præscripta.

And the Glos's on the Canon Law there owns the Scripture to be the Rule for matters of Faith; but very pleasantly applies it to the Clergy, and thinks Images enough for the Laity.

Caus. 24. *q.* 1. *c. Non afferentes.* The Scriptures are acknowledged to be *the true Balance; and that we are not so much to weigh what we find there, as to own what we find there already weighed.* Which must imply the Scripture alone to be that *Measure we are to trust to.*

Dist. 8. *c.* 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. It is there said, *that Custome must yield to Truth and Reason, when that is discovered, and that for this Reason, because Christ said, I am Truth and not Custome.* Now, if Tradition be an Infallible Rule of Faith, Custome ought always to be presumed to have Truth and Reason of its side. For, if we can once suppose a Custome to prevail in the Church against Truth and Reason, it is impossible that Tradition should be Infallible; for what is that but Ancient Custome?

Caus. 11. *Q.* 3. *c.* 101. *Si is qui præest. If any one commands what God hath forbidden, or forbids what God hath commanded, he is to be accursed of all that love God. And if he requires any thing besides the Will of God, or what God hath evidently required in Scripture, he is to be looked on as a false Witness of God, and a Sacrilegious Person.* How can this be, if there be another infallible way of conveying the Will of God besides the Scriptures?

Sed in hanc insipientiam cadunt, qui cùm ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad Propheticas voces, non ad Apostolicas literas, nec ad Evangelicas auctoritates, sed ad seipsos recurrunt.

Caus. 24. *q.* 3. *c.* 30. *c. Quid autem. In matters of doubt it is said that men are to fly to the Written word for satisfaction, and that it is folly not to doe it.* It is true, Mens own Fancies are opposed to Scripture, but against Mens Fancies no other Rule is mentioned but that of the Written Word.

Joh. 22. *Extravag. c. Quia quorundam. Tit.* 14. makes his Appeal to Scripture in the Controversie then on foot about Use and Property; *Dicunt nobis ubi legunt, &c.* and he shews *that if it were a matter of Faith, it must be contained in Scripture, either expresly or by reduction; otherwise the Scripture would be no certain Rule; and by consequence, the Articles of Faith which are proved by*

Nec quasi hoc sacra Scriptura contineat, quo negato tota Scriptura sacra redditur dubia; & per consequens articuli Fidei, qui habeat per

by Scripture, would be rendred doubtfull and uncertain. *Scripturam ſacram probari redditur dubii & incerti.*

The Gloſſer there ſaith, *Whence comes this conſequence?* and refers to another place; where he makes it out thus; *that Faith can onely be proved by the Scripture, and therefore if the Authority of that be deſtroy'd, Faith would be taken away.* The Roman Editors for an Antidote refer to Cardinal *Turrecremata*, who doth indeed ſpeak of *Catholick Truths*, which are not to be found in the *Canon* of *Scripture*; and he quotes a paſſage in the *Canon Law* for it under the name of *Alex.* 3. *c. cum Marthæ Extrav. de Celebr. Miſſæ.* but in truth it is *Innoc.* 3. *Decretal. l.* 3. *Tit.* 41. and yet this will not prove what he aims at; for the Queſtion was about the Authour of the Words added in the Euchariſt to thoſe of Chriſt's Inſtitution; and he pleads that many of Chriſt's words and actions are omitted by the Evangeliſts, which the Apoſtles afterwards ſet down; and he inſtances in Saint *Paul*, as to thoſe words of Chriſt, *It is more bleſſed to give than to receive*; and elſewhere. But what is all this to Catholick Truths not being contained in Scripture either in words or by conſequence? The Cardinal was here very much to ſeek, when he had nothing but ſuch a Teſtimony as this to produce in ſo weighty and ſo new a Doctrine. The beſt Argument he produces is, a horrible blunder of *Gratian's*, where S. *Auguſtin* ſeems to reckon the Decretal Epiſtles equal with the Scriptures, *Diſt.* 19. *c. in Canonicis*; which the Roman Correctors were aſhamed of, and confeſs that S. *Auguſtin* ſpeaks onely of Canonical Epiſtles in Scripture. So hard muſt they ſtrain, who among Chriſtians would ſet up any other Rule equal with the Written Word.

Extrav. Joh. 22. Cum inter Gloſſ. per conſequens. Turrecrem. *de Eccleſia, l.* 4. *part.* 2. *c.* 9.

Turrecrem. *l.* 2. *c.* 18.

4. I proceed to prove this from the ancient Offices of the Roman Church.

Morin. *de Ordinat. Sacris, p.* 275. In the Office produced by *Morinus* out of the Vatican *MS.* which he ſaith *was very ancient*; the Biſhop before his Conſecration was asked, *If he would accommodate all his prudence, to the beſt of his skill, to the Senſe of Holy Scripture?*

Reſp. *Yes, I will with all my heart conſent, and obey it in all things.*

Inter. *Wilt thou teach the People by Word and Example, the things which thou learneſt out of holy Scriptures?*

Reſp. *I will.*

And then immediately follows the *Examen* about Manners.

Morin. *p.* 333. In another old Office of S. *Victor*'s, there are the ſame Queſtions in the ſame manner.

Mabillon *Analect. To.* 2. *p.* 468. And ſo in another of the Church of *Rouen* lately produced by *Mabillon*, which he ſaith was about *William* the Conquerour's time, there is not a word about *Traditions*; which crept into the *Ordo Romanus*, and from thence hath been continued in the Roman Pontificals. But it is obſervable, that the *Ordo Romanus* owns that the *Examen* was originally taken out of the Gallican Offices, (although it does not appear in thoſe imperfect ones lately publiſhed at *Rome* by *Thomaſius*) and therefore we may juſtly ſuſpect that the additional Queſtions about Traditions were the Roman Interpolations, after it came to be uſed in that Pontifical.

And the firſt Office in *Morinus* was the true ancient Gallican Office. But if Tradition had been then owned as a Rule of Faith, it ought no more to have been omitted in the ancient Offices than in the modern.

And the ancient Writers about Eccleſiaſtical Offices ſpeak very agreeably to the moſt ancient Offices about this matter. *Amalarius* ſaith *the Goſpel is the Fountain of Wiſedom; and that the Preachers ought to prove the Evan-*

Amalarius *de Officiis, l.* 3. *c.* 5.

Evangelical Truth out of the ſacred Books. Iſidore, that we ought to think nothing (as to matters of Faith) *but what is contained in the two Teſtaments. Rabanus Maurus, that the knowledge of the Scriptures is the foundation and perfection of Prudence, That Truth and Wiſedom are to be tried by them; and the perfect inſtruction of Life is contained in them.* Our Venerable *Bede* agrees with them, when he ſaith, *that the true Teachers take out of the Scriptures of the old and new Teſtament that which they preach: and therefore have their minds imploy'd in finding out the true meaning of them.*

Iſidor. *de Offic. l. 2. c. 23.*

Rab. Maur. *de Inſt. Cler. l. 3. c. 2. l. 2. c. 53.*

Bed. *in Cant. l. 5.*

De Tabernaculo l. 1. c. 6.

5. I now come to the *Fathers*; wherein I am in great meaſure prevented by a late Diſcourſe, wherein it is at large ſhewed that the *Fathers* made uſe of no other Rule but the *Scriptures* for deciding Controverſies; therefore I ſhall take another method, which is to ſhew that thoſe who do ſpeak moſt advantageouſly of *Tradition*, did not intend to ſet up another *Rule of Faith* diſtinct from Scripture.

Vindic. of the Anſw. to ſome late Papers.

And here I ſhall paſs over all thoſe Teſtimonies of Fathers which ſpeak either of *Tradition* before the *Canon* of *Scripture*, or to thoſe who did not receive it, or of the *Tradition* of *Scripture* it ſelf, or of ſome *Rites* and *Cuſtoms* of the *Church*, as wholly impertinent. And when theſe are cut off, there remain ſcarce any to be conſidered, beſides that of *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, and one Teſtimony of S. *Baſil.*

I begin with *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, who by ſome is thought ſo great a Favourer of Tradition; but he ſaith not a word of it as a Rule of Faith diſtinct from Scripture; for he aſſerts the *Canon of Scripture to be ſufficient of it ſelf for all things.* How can that be, if Tradition be a Rule of Faith diſtinct from it? He makes indeed Catholick Tradition the beſt Interpreter of Scripture; and

Commonit. 1. c. 2.

Cùm ſit perfectus Scripturarum Canon ſibiq; ad omnia ſatis ſuperq; ſufficiat.

and we have no reaſon to decline it in the Points in diſpute between us, if *Vincentius* his Rules be follow'd.

1. *If Antiquity, Univerſality and Conſent be joyned.*

2. *If the difference be obſerved between old Errours*
c. 39. *and new ones. For,* ſaith he, *when they had length of time, Truth is more eaſily concealed, by thoſe who are concerned to ſuppreſs it. And in thoſe Caſes we have no other way to deal with them, but by Scripture and ancient Councils.* And this is the Rule we profeſs to hold to.

But to ſuppoſe any one part of the Church to aſſume to it ſelf the Title of Catholick, and then to determine what is to be held for Catholick Tradition by all Members of the Catholick Church, is a thing in it ſelf unreaſonable, and leaves that part under an impoſſibility of being reclaimed. For in caſe the Corrupt Part be judge, we may be ſure no Corruptions will be ever owned. *Vin-*
c. 6. *centius* grants that *Arianiſm* had once extremely the advantage in Point of Univerſality, and had many Councils of its ſide; if now the prevailing Party be to judge of *Catholick Tradition*, and all are bound to ſubmit to its Decrees without farther Examination, as the Authour
Of the Neceſſity of Church-Guides p. 201. of *the Guide in Controverſies* ſaith upon theſe Rules of *Vincentius*; then I ſay all men were then bound to declare themſelves *Arians*. For if *the Guides of the preſent Church are to be truſted and relied upon for the Doctrine of the Apoſtolical Church downwards*; how was it poſſible for any Members of the Church then to oppoſe *Arianiſm*, and to reform the Church after its prevalency?
p. 199. To ſay *it was condemned by a former Council*, doth by no means clear the difficulty; For *the preſent Guides muſt be truſted*, whether they were rightly condemned or not; and nothing can be more certain, than that they would be ſure to condemn thoſe who condemned them. But

Vincen-

Vincentius ſaith, *Every true Lover of Chriſt preferred the ancient Faith before the novel betraying of it*; but then he muſt chuſe this ancient Faith againſt the judgment of the preſent Guides of the Church. And therefore that, according to *Vincentius*, can be no Infallible Rule of Faith.

But *whether the preſent Univerſality diſſents from Antiquity, whoſe Judgment ſhould be ſooner taken than its own?* ſaith the ſame Authour, This had been an excellent Argument in the mouth of *Urſacius* or *Valens* at the Council of *Ariminum*; and I do not ſee what Anſwer the Guide in Controverſies could have made. *But both are Parties, and is not the Councils Judgment to be taken rather than a few Oppoſers?* So that, for all that I can find by theſe Principles, *Arianiſm* having the greater number, had hard luck not to be eſtabliſhed as the Catholick Faith. But if in that caſe, particular Perſons were to judge between the New and the Old Faith, then the ſame Reaſon will ſtill hold, unleſs the Guides of the Church have obtained a new Patent of Infallibility ſince that time.

The great Queſtion among us, is, Where the true ancient Faith is; and how we may come to find it out? We are willing to follow the ancient Rules in this matter. The Scripture is allowed to be an Infallible Rule on all hands; and I am proving that Tradition was not allowed in the ancient Church as diſtinct from it. But the preſent Queſtion is, how far Tradition is to be allowed in giving the Senſe of Scripture between us. *Vincentius* ſaith, *we ought to follow it when there is Antiquity, Univerſality and Conſent:* This we are willing to be tryed by. But here comes another Queſtion, Who is to be Judge of theſe? *The preſent Guides of the Catholick Church?* To what purpoſe then are all thoſe Rules? Will they condemn them-

p. 199. themſelves? Or, as the *Guide* admirably ſaith, *If the preſent Univerſality be its own Judge, when can we think it will witneſs its departure from the true Faith?* And if it will not, what a Caſe is the Church in, under ſuch a pretended *Univerſality?*

The utmoſt uſe I can ſuppoſe then, *Vincentius* his Rules can be of to us now, is in that Caſe which he puts when Corruptions and Errours have had time to take root and faſten themſelves; and that is, *By an Appeal to Scripture and Ancient Councils.* But becauſe of the charge of Innovation upon us, we are content to be tried by his ſecond Rule. *By the Conſent of the Fathers of greateſt Reputation, who are agreed on all hands to have lived and died in the Communion of the Catholick Church: and what they delivered freely, conſtantly and unanimouſly, let that be taken for the undoubted and certain Rule in judging between us.* But *if the preſent Guides muſt come in to be Judges here again*, then all our labour is loſt, and *Vincentius* his Rules ſignifie juſt nothing,

Tabulæ Suffragial. p. 54. The Teſtimony of S. *Baſil* is by Mr. *White* magnified above the reſt, and that out of his Book *de Spiritu Sancto* above all others, to prove that the Certainty of Faith depends on Tradition; and not merely on Scripture. The force of it is ſaid to lye in this, *that the practice of the Church, in ſaying, with the holy Spirit, though not found in Scripture is to determine the Senſe of the Article of Faith about the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt.* But to clear this place, we are to obſerve,

1. That S. *Baſil* doth not inſiſt on Tradition for the Proof of the Article of Faith, for he expreſly diſowns it in that Book; *It is not enough*, ſaith he, *that we have it by Tradition from our Fathers; for our Fathers had it from the Will of God in Scripture, as appears by thoſe*

Ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἐξαρκεῖ, ὅτι τῶν πατέρων ἡ παράδοσις, κἀκεῖνοι γὰρ τῷ βουλήματι τῆς γραφῆς ἠκολούθησαν, ἐκ τῶν μαρτυριῶν, ἃς μικρῷ

those Teſtimonies I have ſet down already, which they took for their Foundations. Nothing can be plainer than that S. *Baſil* made Scripture alone the Foundation of Faith as to this Point. And no one upon all Occaſions ſpeaks more expreſly than he doth as to the Sufficiency of Scripture for a Rule of Faith; and he was too great, and too wiſe a Man to contradict himſelf.

πρὸ δὲν ὑμῖν ἐκ τ γραφῆς παρεθέμεθα, τὰ ἀρχὰς λαβόντες. *De Sp. Sancto c. 7.*

De vera fide, p. 386. A. C. p. 391. C.

2. That there were different forms of ſpeech uſed in the Church concerning the Holy Ghoſt, ſome taken out of Scripture, and others received by Tradition from the Fathers. When he proves the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt he appeals to Scripture, and declares, that he would neither think nor ſpeak otherwiſe than he found there. But it was objected that the Form S. *Baſil* uſed was not found in Scripture; he anſwers, that the equivalent is there found; and that there were ſome things received by Tradition, which had the ſame force towards Piety. And if we take away all unwritten Cuſtoms, we ſhall doe wrong to the Goſpel, and leave a bare name to the Publick Preaching. And from thence he inſiſts on ſome Traditionary Rites, as the Sign of the Croſs, Praying towards the Eaſt, *&c.* His buſineſs is to ſhew that to the greater ſolemnity of Chriſtian Worſhip ſeveral Cuſtoms were obſerved in the Church, which are not to be found in Scripture. And if other ancient Cuſtoms were received which are not commanded in Scripture, he ſees no Reaſon that they ſhould find ſuch fault with this. And this is the whole force of S. *Baſil*'s Reaſoning, which can never be ſtretched to the ſetting up Tradition as a Rule of Faith diſtinct from Scripture.

Aſcet. Reg. 26. Reg 80. c. 22.

De Sp. San. c. 9.

c. 10.

c. 21.

c. 29.

Having thus ſhewed that there was no Catholick Tradition for this New Rule of Faith, I am now to give an Account how it came into the Church.

The first Step that was made towards it, was by the second Council of *Nice*. For, although the Emperour in the Synodical Epistle proposed to them the true ancient Mehod of judging in Councils, *By the Books of Scripture placed on a Throne in the middle of the Council*; yet they found, they could by no means doe their busines that Way, and therefore as *Bellarmin* observes, they set up *Tradition* in the 6th and 7th Sessions, and pronounced Anathema's against those who rejected unwritten Traditions. But although there were then almost as little pretence for Tradition as Scripture in the matter of Images; yet there having been a practice among them, to set up and to worship Images, (which *Richerius* thinks came first into the Church from the Reverence shewed to the Emperours Statues) they thought this the secureſt way to advance that, which they could never defend by Scripture.

Richer. *Hist. Conc. General. l.* 1. *c.* 11. *n.* 13.

But this prevailed very little in the Western Church, as is well known by the rejection of that Synod; however Pope *Hadrian* joined with them, and produced a wretched Tradition about *Sylvester* and *Constantine* to justifie their Proceedings; as appears by the Acts of that Council. And from the time that Images were received at *Rome*, the force of Tradition was magnified; and by degrees it came to be made use of to justifie other Practices, for which they had nothing else to plead.

Hitherto Tradition was made use of for matters of Practice, and the Scripture was generally received as the Rule of Faith; but some of the Schoolmen found it impossible to defend some Doctrines held in the Church of *Rome* by mere Scripture, and therefore they were forced to call in the Help of Tradition. The most remarkable of these was *Scotus*, who although in his Prologue he asserted,

ſerted, as is ſaid already, *that the Scripture did ſufficiently contain all things neceſſary to ſalvation*; yet when he came to particular Points, he found Scripture alone would never doe their buſineſs. And eſpecially as to the Sacraments of the Church, about which he ſaw the Church of *Rome* then held many things which could never be proved from thence. And this was the true occaſion of Traditions being taken in for a partial Rule.

Scot. in l. 1. Sent. Diſt. 11.

For after the Council of *Lateran* had declared ſeveral things to be of Faith, which were in no former Creeds, as *Scotus* confeſſes, and they were bound to defend them as Points of Faith, the Men of Wit and Subtilty, ſuch as *Scotus* was, were very hard put to it, to find out ways to prove thoſe to have been old Points of Faith, which they knew to be very new. Then they betook themſelves to two things, which would ſerve for a colour to blind the common People; and thoſe were,

l. 4. Diſt. 11. n. 15.

1. That it was true, theſe things were not in Scripture; but *Chriſt ſaid to his Diſciples, I have many things to ſay unto you*, &c. and among thoſe many things they were to believe theſe new Doctrines to be ſome.

2. When this would not ſerve, then they told them, though theſe Doctrines were not explicitly in Scripture, yet they were implicitly there; and the Church had authority to fetch them out of thoſe dark places, and to ſet them in a better light. And thus *Scotus* helped himſelf out in that dark Point of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Firſt he attempts to make it out by Tradition, but finding that would not doe the buſineſs effectually, he runs to the Authority of the Church, eſpecially in the buſineſs of Sacraments, and *we are to ſuppoſe*, ſaith he, *that the Church doth expound the Scripture with the ſame Spirit which indited them*. This was a brave *Suppoſition* indeed, but he offers no proof of it.

n. 13.

If we allow *Scotus* to have been the Introducer of *Tradition*, as to ſome Points of Faith, yet I have made it appear, that his Doctrine was not received in the Schools. But after the Council of *Conſtance* had declared ſeveral Propoſitions to be *Heretical*, which could not be condemned by Scripture, there was found a Neceſſity of holding, that there were *Catholick Truths* not contained in Scripture. The firſt Propoſition there condemned was, *That the Subſtance of Bread and Wine remain in the Sacrament of the Altar:* the ſecond, *That the Accidents do not remain without their Subject:* Now how could ſuch as theſe be condemned by Scripture? But although onely ſome were ſaid to be *Heretical*, yet all were ſaid to be *againſt Catholick Truth*. But where is this *Catholick Truth* to be found? Cardinal *Cuſanus* thought of a *current ſenſe of Scripture, according to the Churches Occaſions*; ſo that though the Churches Practice ſhould be directly contrary, yet the Scripture was to be underſtood as the Church practiſed. This was a very plain and effectual way, if it had not been too groſs; and therefore it was thought much better by Cardinal *Turrecremata*, to found Catholick Verities on *unwritten Tradition*, as well as on Scripture.

Scripturas eſſe ad tempus adaptatas & variè intellectas, ità ut uno tempore ſecundùm currentem univerſalem ritum exponerentur, mutato ritu iterum ſententia mutaretur Cuſan. *ad* Bohem. *Epiſt.* 2.

After this, *Leo* X. in his famous Bull againſt *Luther*, *Exurge Domine*, made a farther ſtep; for 22 Propoſition condemned therein, is *That it is certain that it is not in the power of the Church or Pope to appoint new Articles of Faith.* It ſeems then the Pope or Church have a Power to conſtitute new Articles of Faith; and then neither Scripture nor Tradition can be the certain Rule of Faith, but the Preſent Church or Pope.

This had put an end to the buſineſs, if it would have taken; but the World being wiſer, and the Errours and Cor-

Corruptions complained of not being to be defended by Scripture, Tradition was pitched upon as a ſecure Way; and accordingly ſeveral attempts were made towards the ſetting of it up, by ſome Provincial Councils before that of *Trent*. So in the Council of *Sens*, 1527. Can. 53. It is declared to be a pernicious Errour to receive nothing but what is deduced from Scripture, becauſe Chriſt delivered many things to his Apoſtles which were never written. But not one thing is alledged as a matter of Faith ſo conveyed; but onely ſome Rites about Sacraments and Prayer; and yet he is declared a Heretick as well as Schiſmatick, who rejects them. Indeed *the Apoſtles Creed* is mentioned, but not as to the Articles contained in it, but as to the *Authours* of it. But what is there in all this that makes a man guilty of Hereſie?

Jod. Clicthoveus, a Doctor of *Paris*, the next Year wrote an Explication and Defence of this Council, but he miſtakes the Point; for he runs upon it as if it were, *whether all things to be believed and obſerved in the Church, were to be expreſly ſet down in Scripture*? whereas a juſt conſequence out of it is ſufficient. And the greateſt ſtrength of what he ſaith to the purpoſe, is, *that the other Opinion was condemned in the Council of* Conſtance.

And from no better a Tradition than this did the Council of *Trent* declare *the unwritten Word to be a Rule of Faith equal with the Scriptures.*

II. About

II. About the Canon of Scripture, defined by the Council of Trent.

This is declared by the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 4. and therein the Books of *Tobias*, *Judith*, *Wiſedom of* Solomon, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Maccabees* and *Baruch* are received for *Canonical*, *with the twenty two Books* in the *Hebrew Canon*, and an *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe who do not. And preſently it adds, *that hereby the World might ſee what Authorities the Council proceeded on for confirming matters of Faith as well as reforming manners.*

Now to ſhew that there was no *Catholick Tradition* for the ground of this *Decree*, we are to obſerve,

1. That theſe *Canonical Books* are not ſo called in a large ſenſe for ſuch as have been uſed or read in the *Church*; but in the ſtrict ſenſe for ſuch as are a good *Foundation* to build matters of Faith upon.

2. That theſe Books were not ſo received by all even in the *Council* of *Trent*. For what is received by virtue of a *Catholick Tradition*, muſt be univerſally received by the Members of it. But that ſo it was not appears by the account given by both the Hiſtorians. *F. Paul* ſaith, *that in the Congregation there were two different Opinions of thoſe who were for a particular Catalogue; one was to diſtinguiſh the Books into three parts, the other to make all the Books of equal authority; and that this latter was carried by the greater number.* Now if this were a *Catholick Tradition*, how was it poſſible for the Fathers of the Council to divide about it? And Cardinal *Pallavicini* himſelf ſaith, *that* Bertanus *and* Seripandus *propounded the putting the Books into ſeveral Claſſes, ſome to be read for Piety, and others to confirm Doctrines of Faith*; and *that Cardinal* Seripando *wrote a moſt learned*

Hiſt. of the Council of Tr. *l.* 2. *p.* 154.

Ibid. l. 6. *c.* 11. *p.* 4.

ned Book to that purpose. What! against a *Catholick Tradition*? It seems, he was far from believing it to be so. And he confesses, *that when they came to the Anathema, the Legats and twenty Fathers were for it*; Madrucci *and fourteen were against it, because some Catholicks were of another opinion.* Then certainly, they knew no *Catholick Tradition* for it. p. 8.

Among these Cardinal *Cajetan* is mention'd, *who was*, saith *Pallavicini, severely rebuked for it by* Melchior Canus; but what is that to the *Tradition* of the Church? *Canus* doth indeed appeal to the Council of *Carthage*, *Innocentius* I. and the Council of *Florence*; but this doth not make up a *Catholick Tradition* against *Cajetan*; who declares that he follows S. *Jerom*, who cast those Books out of the *Canon* with Respect to Faith. And he answers the Arguments brought on the other side, by this distinction, that they are *Canonical for Edification, but not for Faith.* If therefore *Canus* would have confuted *Cajetan* he ought to have proved that they were owned for *Canonical* in the latter Sense. *Cajetan* in his Epistle to *Clemens* VII. before the Historical Books, owns the great Obligation of the Church to S. *Jerom* for distinguishing *Canonical and Apocryphal Books*; and saith, *that he hath freed it from the Reproach of the Jews, who said the Christians made Canonical Books of the Old Testament which they knew nothing of.* And this was an Argument of great consequence; but *Canus* takes no notice of it, and it fully answers his Objection, *that men could not know what Books were truly Canonical*, viz. such as were of *divine inspiration, and so received by the Jews.* *Catharinus* saith, in Answer to *Cajetan*, *that the Jews had one Canon, and the Church another.* But how comes the Canon to be received as of *divine Inspiration* which was not so received among the Jews? This were to resolve

Can. Loc. Theol. l. 2. c. 11.

Cajet. *in Eccles. fine.*

Ad Ester c. 10. ad fin.

Annot. in Cajet. l. 1. p. 5.

ſolve all into the Churches *Inſpiration* and not into *Tradition.*

De Verb. Dei, l. 1. c. 11. *Bellarmin* grants, *that the Church can by no means make a Book Canonical which is not ſo, but onely declare what is Canonical, and that, not at pleaſure; but from ancient Teſtimonies, from ſimilitude of ſtyle with Books uncontroverted, and the general Senſe and Taſte of Chriſtian People.* Now the Caſe here relates to Books not firſt written to Chriſtians, but among the *Jews*, from whom we receive *the Oracles of God committed to them.* And if the *Jews* never believed theſe Books to contain *the Oracles of God* in them, how can the Chriſtian Church embrace them for ſuch, unleſs it aſſumes a Power to make, and not merely to declare Canonical Books? For he grants we have no Teſtimony of the *Jews* for them.

But *Catharinus* himſelf cannot deny *that S.* Jerom *ſaith, that although the Church reads thoſe Books, yet it doth not receive them for Canonical Scriptures.* And he makes a pitifull Anſwer to it. For he confeſſes, *that the Church taken for the Body of the Faithfull did not receive them; but as taken for the Governours it did.* But others grant that they did receive them no more than the People; and as to the other, the cauſe of Tradition is plainly given us. And in truth he reſolves all at laſt into the opinion of the Popes *Innocentius*, *Gelaſius* and *Eugenius* 4. But we are obliged to him for letting us know the Secret of ſo much zeal for theſe *Apocryphal Books*, viz. *that they are of great force againſt the Hereticks, for Purgatory is no where ſo expreſly mention'd as in the Maccabees.* If it had not been for this, S. *Jerom* and *Cajetan* might have eſcaped Cenſure, and the *Jewiſh Canon* had been ſufficient.

Jul. Ruger. *de libris Canonicis, p.* 80.

p. 41.

But

But to ſhew, that there hath been no *Catholick Tradition* about the *Tridentine Canon*, I ſhall prove theſe two things:

1. That there hath been a *conſtant Tradition againſt it* in the *Eaſtern Church.*

2. That there never was a *conſtant Tradition* for it in the *Weſtern Church.*

1. That there hath been a *conſtant Tradition againſt it in the Eaſtern Church*, which received the *Jewiſh Canon*, without the Books declared *Canonical* by the *Council* of *Trent.* We have very early Evidence of this in the Teſtimony of *Melito*, Biſhop of *Sardis*, who lived not long after the middle of the 2d. Century, and made it his buſineſs to enquire into this matter, and *he delivers but* Euſeb. *l.* 4. *c.* 25. *22 Books of the Old Teſtament.* The ſame is done by *Origen* in the next, who took infinite Pains, as *Euſebius* *l.* 6. *c.* 25. ſaith, in ſearching after the *Copies* of the Old Teſtament. *Philocal. c.* 3. And theſe Teſtimonies are preſerved by *Euſebius* in the following Century: and himſelf declares, *that there was no ſacred Book among the Jews from the time of* Zorobabel; which cuts off the Books canonized by the Council of *Trent.* In the ſame Age we have the Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Baſil*, S. *Gregory Nazianzene*, *Amphilochius* and S. *Chryſoſtom:* It is not to be imagined that a *Tradition* ſhould be better atteſted in one Age than this was, by ſo conſiderable Men in different Churches, who give in the Teſtimony of all thoſe Churches they belonged to. And yet beſides theſe we have in that Age a concurrent Teſtimony of a Council of Biſhops at *Laodicea*, from *ſeveral Provinces* of *Aſia*; and *Conc.* Laodicea, *c.* 59. which is yet more, this *Canon* of theirs was received into

Euſeb. *Demonſtr. l.* 8. *p.* 368.

Chronic. Gr. p. 172.

Athanaſ. *Ep.* 39. Cyril. *Catech.* 4. Epiph. *de menſuris & ponder.* Baſil. *in* Origen. *Philocal.* Greg. Nazianzen. *in Carm.* Amph. *in Canon. Ep. apud* Balſam. *S.* Chryſoſt. *in* Gen. *hom.* 4.

the *Code* of the *Catholick Church*; and ſo owned by the Council of *Chalcedon*, which by its firſt Canon gives Authority to it. And *Juſtinian* allows the force of *Laws* to the *Canons* which were either made or confirmed by the four *General Councils*. But it is the point of *Tradition* I am upon; and therefore *Juſtinian's Novel* may at leaſt be a ſtrong Evidence of that in the 6th Century: In the 7th, *Leontius* gives his own Teſtimony, and that of *Theodorus*. In the 8th, *Damaſcen* expreſly owns the *Hebrew Canon* of 22 *Books*, and excludes by name ſome of the Books made *Canonical* at *Trent*. In the 9th we have the Teſtimony of *Nicephorus, Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, if he be the Authour of the *Laterculus*, at the end of his *Chronography*; but if he be not, he muſt be an Authour of that Age, being tranſlated by *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*. In the 12th. *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* refer to the Council of *Laodicea*, and the *Greek Fathers*. In the 14th. *Nicephorus Caliſthus* reckons but 22 *Books of the Old Teſtament*. And in this Age, we have the clear Teſtimony of *Metrophanes*, (afterwards Patriarch of *Alexandria*) who ſaith, *there are but* 22 *Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament*; *but the reſt*, i. e. *Tobit, Judith, Wiſedom, Eccleſiaſticus, Baruch* and *Machabees are uſefull, and therefore not wholly to be rejected, but the Church never received them for Canonical and Authentical, as appears by many Teſtimonies, as, among others, of* Gregory *the Divine*, Amphilochius *and* Damaſcen: *and therefore we never prove matters of Faith out of them.*

Novel. 131.

Leont. *de Sectis, Act.* 2. Damaſcen. *de Fide, lib.* 4. *c.* 18.

Niceph *Chronogr. p.* 419.

Anaſtaſ. *Hiſt. p.* 189. *Not. in Can.* 27. Carthag. Niceph. *in Epigram.* Metroph. *Confeſſ. c.* 7. *p.* 82. Phil. Cyprii *Chronic. Eccleſ. Græc. p.* 459.

2. Let us now compare this *Tradition* with that of the *Weſtern Church* for the *New Canon* of *Trent*. It cannot be denied, that *Innocentius* I. and *Gelaſius* did enlarge the Canon, and took in the *Apocryphal Books* (unleſs we call in queſtion the Writings under their Names;) but granting them genuine, I ſhall ſhew that there is no compariſon

riſon between this *Tradition* and that of the *Eaſtern Church*, and therefore there could be no poſſible Reaſon for the Council of *Trent* to make a Decree for this *Tradition*, and to *anathematize* all who did not ſubmit to it. For,

1. This *Tradition* was not *univerſally* received at that time. *Innocentius* his Epiſtle is ſuppoſed to be written *A.D.* 405. Was the Weſtern Church agreed before or after about this matter? This Epiſtle was written to *Eruperius*, a Gallican Biſhop, (to whom St. *Jerom* dedicated his Commentaries on *Zechariah*,) but now it unluckily falls out, that the *Tradition* of the *Gallican Church* was contrary to this; as appears by S. *Hilary*, (who could not be ignorant of it, being a famous Biſhop of that Church) and he tells us, *there were but* 22 *Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament.* I confeſs he ſaith, *ſome were for adding* Tobit *and* Judith, but it is very obſervable that he ſaith, *that the other Account is moſt agreeable to ancient Tradition*, which is a mighty Argument againſt *Innocentius*, who brings no Tradition to juſtifie his Canon. When St. *Auguſtin* produced a Place out of the Book of *Wiſedom*, the Divines of *Marſeilles* rejected it; *becauſe the Book was not Canonical:* Therefore in that time *Innocent*'s Canon was by no means received in the *Gallican Church*; for by it this Book was made *Canonical.* But S. *Jerom*, who had as much learning as Pope *Innocent*, vehemently oppoſed this *New Canon* more than once or ten times; and not onely ſpeaks of the *Jewiſh Canon*, but of the *Canon of the Church. The Church*, ſaith he, *reads the Books of* Tobit, Judith *and* Machabees, *but the Church doth not receive them among Canonical Scriptures.* What *Church* doth he mean? Not the *Synagogue* certainly. Pope *Innocent* ſaith, *Thoſe Books are to be received into the Canon*; S. *Jerom* ſaith, *the Church doth not receive them, but that they are to be caſt out*; Where is the Certainty

Hilar. *Prolog. in* Pſalm.

De Prædeſt. Sanctor. c. 14.

Prolog. Gal. *Prolog. in lib.* Salom. *ad* Paul. *&* Euſt. *ad* Chromat.

of Tradition to be found? If *Innocent* were in the right, S. *Jerom* was foully miſtaken, and in plain terms belied the Church. But how is this conſiſtent with the *Saintſhip* of St. *Jerom*? Or with common diſcretion if the Church did receive thoſe Books for Canonical? For every one could have diſproved him. And it required no great Judgment or deep Learning to know what Books were received, and what not. If S. *Jerom* were ſo miſtaken (which it is very hard to believe) how came *Ruffinus* not to obſerve his errours and oppoſition to the Church? Nay, how came *Ruffinus* himſelf to fall into the very ſame prodigious miſtake? For he not onely rejects the controverted Books out of the *Canon*, but ſaith, *he follow'd the ancient Tradition therein.* What account can be given of this matter? If *Innocent's* Tradition were right, theſe men were under a groſs Deluſion; and yet they were learned and knowing Perſons, and more than ordinarily converſant in the *Doctrines and Traditions* of the Church.

Ruffin. *in Symbol. pag.* 188, 189.

2. This Opinion was not received as a *Tradition* of the *Church* afterwards. For, if it had been, how could *Gregory* I. reject the Book of *Machabees* out of the *Canon*, when two of his Predeceſſours took it in? It is ſomewhat hard, to ſuppoſe one Pope to contradict two of his Predeceſſours about the *Canon of Scripture*; yet I ſee not how to avoid it; nor how it is conſiſtent with the *Conſtancy* of *Tradition*, much leſs with the pretence to *Infallibility*. He did not *merely doubt*, as *Canus* would have it thought, but he plainly excludes them out of the Canon. *Catharinus* thinks *he follow'd S.* Jerom. What then? Doth this exclude his contradicting his Predeceſſours? Or was S. *Jerom's* Judgment above the Pope's? But it was not S. *Gregory* alone who contradicted the former Popes Canon; for it was not received either in *Italy*

Greg. *Moral. in* Job. *l.* 19. *c.* 17.

Can. *Loc. Theol. l.* 2. *c.* 11. *ad* 4. Cath. *de Canonicis Scrip. in Opuſcul. p.* 302.

Italy, Spain, France, Germany or *England*; and yet no doubt it was *a very Catholick Tradition.*

Not in *Italy*; for there *Cassiodore*, a learned and devout Man in the next Century to them, gives an account of the Canon of Scripture, and he takes not any notice either of *Innocent* or *Gelasius*. He first sets down the Order of Scripture according to S. *Jerom*; and then according to S. *Augustin*; and in the last place, according to the old Translation and the *LXX.* and where himself speaks of the *Apocryphal Books* before, he follows S. Jerom's *Opinion, that they were written rather for manners than Doctrine.* He confesses there was a difference about *the Canon*; but he goes about to excuse it. But what need that if there were a *Catholick Tradition* then in the Church concerning it, and that inforced by two Popes?

Cassiodor. *de Instit. Divin. litter. cap.* 12, 13, 14. c. 6.

But it may yet seem stranger, that even in *Italy*, one canonized for a Saint by *Clemens* VII. should follow S. *Jerom's* Opinion in this matter, *viz.* S. *Antoninus*, Bishop of *Florence*. Who speaking of *Ecclesiasticus* received into the Canon of the two Popes, he saith, *it is onely received by the Church to be read, and is not authentick to prove any thing in matters of Faith.* He that writes Notes upon him, saith, *that he follows S.* Jerom, and *must be understood of the Eastern Church; for the Western Church always receiv'd these Books into the Canon.* But he speaks not one word of the *Eastern Church*; and by the *Church* he could understand nothing but what he accounted the *Catholick Church. Canus* allows *Antoninus to have rejected these Books*; *but he thinks the matter not so clear, but then they might doubt concerning it.* Then there was no such Evidence of *Tradition* to convince men. But *Antoninus* hath preserved the Judgment of a greater man concerning these Books even *Thomas Aquinas*

S. Antonin. *Sum. Hist. P.* 1. *Tit.* 3. c. 4.

Can. *Loc. Theol. l.* 2. c. 11.

Part. 3. *Tit.* 18. c. 6. *Sect.* 2, & 3.

nas, who *in* 2. 2de. he ſaith, *denied theſe Books to have ſuch authority as to prove any matter of Faith by them:* which is directly contrary to the Council of *Trent*. If this paſſage be not now to be found in him, we know whom to blame for it. If *Antoninus* ſaw it there, we hope his word may be taken for it.

Eur. *in Adair. ad* Lyram *ad c.* 1. Eſter. *&* 7. Toſtat. *in* Matt. *Prœf. q.* 1. 2. Xim. *Prœf. ad Bib. Comp.*

In *Spain*, we have for the Hebrew Canon the Teſtimonies of *Paulus Burgenſis*, *Toſtatus*, and Cardinal *Ximines*.

In *France*, of *Victorinus*, *Agobardus*, *Radulphus Flaviacenſis*, *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, *Hugo de S. Victore*, and *Richard de S. Victore*, *Lyra* and others.

In *Germany*, of *Rabanus Maurus*, *Strabus*, *Rupertus*, *Hermannus Contractus* and others.

In *England*, of *Bede*, *Alcvin*, *Sarisburienſis*, *Ockam*, *Waldenſis* and others. Whom I barely mention, becauſe their Teſtimonies are at large in Biſhop *Coſins* his *Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the Canon of Scripture*, and no man hath yet had the hardineſs to undertake that Book.

Theſe I think are ſufficient to ſhew there was no *Catholick Tradition* for the Decree of the Council of *Trent* about the *Canon* of *Scripture*.

I now proceed to ſhew on what pretences and colours it came in, and by what degrees and ſteps it advanced.

1. The firſt ſtep was, the Eſteem which ſome of the Fathers expreſſed of theſe Books in quoting of paſſages out of them. We do not deny that the Fathers did frequently cite them: even thoſe who expreſly rejected them from being *Canonical*, and not as ordinary Books, but as ſuch as were uſefull to the Church, wherein many wiſe Sayings and good Actions are recorded. But the many Quotations the Fathers do make out of them is the onely plauſible pretence which thoſe of the Church of

of *Rome* have to defend the putting them into the Canon, as appears by *Bellarmin* and others. The Book of *Tobit*, they tell us, is mentioned by S. *Cyprian*, S. *Ambroſe*, St. *Baſil*, and St. *Auguſtin*. Of *Judith* by St. *Jerom* who mentions *a Tradition that it was allowed in the Council of* Nice; but certainly S. *Jerom* never believed it, when he declares it to be *Apocryphal*, and not ſufficient to prove any matter of Faith. The Book of *Wiſedom* by S. *Cyprian*, S. *Cyril* and S. *Auguſtin*. *Eccleſiaſticus* by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, S. *Cyprian*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Ambroſe* and S. *Auguſtin*. The *Machabees* by *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtin*. But all theſe Teſtimonies onely prove that they thought ſomething in thoſe Books worth alledging, but not that they judged the Books themſelves *Canonical*. And better Arguments from their Citations might be brought for the Books of the *Sibylls* than for any of theſe. We are not then to judge of their Opinion of *Canonical Books* by bare Citations, but by their declared Judgments about them.

2. The next ſtep was, when they came to be read in Churches; but about this there was no certain Rule. For the Councils of *Laodicea* and *Carthage* differed chiefly upon this Point. The former decreed, *That none but Canonical Scripture ſhould be read under the Name of Holy Writings*; and ſets down the names of the *Canonical Books then to be read*, (and ſo leaves out the *Apocalypſe*.) The latter *from their being read, inferr'd their being Canonical*; for it agrees with the other, *that none but Canonical ſhould be read*, and becauſe theſe were read, it reckons them up with the *Canonical Books*; for ſo the Canon concludes, *We have received from our Fathers that theſe Books are to be read in Churches*.

But

But the Council of *Carthage* was not peremptory in this matter; but desired *it might be referred to* Boniface *and other Bishops beyond the Seas:* Which shews that here was no Decree absolutely made, nor any *Certainty* of *Tradition*; for then to what purpose should they send to other Churches to advise about it?

3. When they came to be distinguished from *Apocryphal Writings.* Whence those who do not consider the Reason of it, conclude them to have been *Canonical.* But sometimes *Apocryphal* signified such Books as were not in *the Canon of Faith*, as in the Authours before mentioned; sometimes such Books which *were not allowed to be used among Christians.* This distinction we have in *Ruffinus*, who saith there are three sorts of Books; *Canonical*, as *the 22 of the Old Testament*; *Ecclesiastical*, of which sort he reckons *Wisedom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Tobit*, *Judith* and *Machabees*, and these he saith *were permitted to be read in Churches*, but no Argument could be brought out of them for matter of Faith, *Apocryphal* are such *which by no means were permitted to be read.* And thus *Innocentius* his words may well be understood: For he concludes with saying, *that other Writings were not onely to be rejected, but to be condemned.* And so his meaning is to distinguish them from such *counterfeit Divine Writings* as were then abroad. For these were not to be wholly rejected, and in that large sense he admits them into the *Canon*, taking *Ecclesiastical Writings* which were read in Churches into that number. And in this sense S. *Augustin* used the Word *Apocryphal*, when the Book of *Enoch* is so called by him, and such other *counterfeit Writings* under the Names of the *Prophets and Apostles*; but elsewhere he distinguishes between the *Canonical Books of* Salomon, *and those which bear his Name*; which he saith *the more learned know not to be his, but the Western*

Aug. *de Civ. Dei, lib.* 15. *c.* 23. *l.*17. *c.*20.

ſtern Church had of old owned their Authority. But in the caſe of the Book of *Enoch*, he appeals to the *Canon*, which *was kept in the Jewiſh Temple*; and ſo falls in with S. *Jerom*; and he confeſſes it is hard to juſtifie the Authority of thoſe which are not in the *Hebrew Canon.* Of the *Machabees* he ſaith, *It is diſtinguiſhed from the Writings called Canonical; but it is received by the Church as ſuch.* What! to confirm matters of Faith? No. But *for the glorious ſufferings therein recorded*; and elſewhere he ſaith, *it is uſefull, if it be ſoberly read.* S. *Auguſtin* knew very well that all Books were not received alike; and that many were received in ſome parts of the Weſtern Church from the old Tranſlation out of the *LXX*, which were not received in the *Eaſtern*; and therefore in his Books of *Chriſtian Doctrine* he gives Rules in judging of *Canonical Books*; to follow *the Authority of the greateſt Number of Catholick Churches, eſpecially the Apoſtolical*; *and that thoſe which were received by all, ſhould be preferred before thoſe which were onely received by ſome.* But he very well knew, that the Hebrew Canon was univerſally received, and that the controverted Books were not; and therefore, according to his Rule, theſe could never be of Equal Authority with the other.

Aug. *de Civ. Dei, l.* 18. *c.* 36.

C. Gaudent. *c.* 29.

De Doctr. l. 3. *c.* 8.

4. When the Roman Church declared that it received the controverted Books into the *Canon.* This is ſaid to have been done by *Gelaſius*, with his *Synod of LXX Biſhops*, (and yet it is hard to underſtand how *Gregory* ſo ſoon after ſhould contradict it.) The Title of it in the old MS. produced by *Chiffletius*, and by him attributed to *Hormiſdas*, is, *The Order of the Old Teſtament which the holy Catholick Roman Church receives and honours is this.* But whether by *Gelaſius*, or *Hormiſdas*, I cannot underſtand, why ſuch a Decree as this ſhould not be put into the old *Roman Code* of *Canons*, if it had been then

Not. in Vigil. Tapſ. *p.* 150.

made. That there was ſuch a one appears by the Copies of it in the *Vatican*, mentioned by the *Roman* Correctors of *Gratian*, and by mention of it by the Canon *Si Romanorum, Diſt.* 19. and *De Libellis, Diſt.* 20. and by the latter we underſtand what Canons of Councils and Decrees of Popes are in it, among whom are both *Gelaſius* and *Hormiſdas*. This they agree to be the ſame with that publiſhed by *Wendelſtin* at *Mentz*, 1525. The Epiſtle of *Innocentius* to *Exuperius* with the *Canon* is there publiſhed; but not the other; and ſo is the Canon of the Council of *Carthage*; but that of *Laodicea* is cut off; and ſo they are in that publiſhed by *Dionyſius Exiguus* and *Queſnell*, (*Juſtellus* his ancient Copy was imperfect there,) but both theſe Canons being in the *Roman Code*, are an Argument to me, that the controverted Books were received by the *Roman Church* at that time; but in ſuch a manner, that S. *Jerom*'s Prologues ſtill ſtood in the *vulgar Latin Bible*, with the Commentaries of *Lyra*, and Additions of *Burgenſis*, which were ſtiff for the *Hebrew Canon*; and S. *Jerom*'s Authority prevailed more than the Pope's, as appears fully by what hath been already produced.

5. To advance the Authority of theſe Books one ſtep higher, *Eugenius* IV. declared them to be *Part of the Canon* in the Inſtruction given to the *Armenians*. Which the Roman Writers pretend to have been done in the Council of *Florence*: But *Naclantus* Biſhop of *Chioza*, in the Council of *Trent*, as *Pallavicini* ſaith, *denied that any ſuch Decree was made by the Council of* Florence; *becauſe the laſt Seſſion of it ended* 1439. *and that Decree was ſigned* Feb. 4. 1441. To this the Legat replied, *that this was a miſtake occaſioned by* Abraham Cretenſis, *who publiſhed the Latin verſion of it, onely till the Greeks departure; but the Council continued three years longer, as appeared by the*

Hiſt. Concil. Trident. l. 6. c. 11. n. 12.

the Extracts of Auguſtinus Patricius, ſince publiſhed in the Tomes of the Councils. But he never mentions the *Canon of Scripture*; however, becauſe *Cervinus* affirms that he ſaw the Original ſigned by the Pope and Cardinals, we have no reaſon to diſpute it. But then it appears how very little it ſignified, when *Antoninus* the Biſhop of *Florence* oppoſed it, and Cardinal *Ximenes* and Cardinal *Cajetan* ſlighted it, and all who embraced the Council of *Baſil* looked on *Eugenius* his Decree as void; and after all, that very Decree onely joins the *Apocryphal Books* in the *ſame Canon*, as the *Council* of *Carthage* had done; but it was reſerved as the peculiar Honour of the *Council* of *Trent* to declare *that Matters of Faith might be proved out of them, as well as out of any Canonical Scriptures.*

III. About the Free Uſe of the Scripture in the vulgar Language, prohibited by the Council of Trent.

To underſtand the Senſe of the Council of *Trent* in this matter, we muſt conſider;

1. *That it declares the vulgar Latin to be Authentick*; i. e. *that no man under any pretence ſhall dare to preſume to reject it.* Suppoſe the pretence be that it differs from the Original; no matter for that, he muſt not reject that which the Council hath declared Authentick, i. e. *among the Latin Editions.* But ſuppoſe a Man finds other Latin Tranſlations truer in ſome parts, becauſe they agree more with the Original Text, may he therein reject the vulgar Latin? By no means, if he thinks himſelf bound to adhere to the Council of *Trent*. *But the Council ſuppoſes it to agree with the Original.* And we muſt believe the Council therein. This is indeed the meaning

of the Council as far as I can judge. But what Catholick Tradition was there for this? *Yes for a thousand years after* Gregory's *time.* But this is not Antiquity enough to found a *Catholick Tradition* upon. If there were no more than a thousand from *Gregory*, there were six hundred past before him; so that there must be a more ancient Tradition in the Church, wherein this version was not *Authentick*; and how came it then to be *Authentick* by virtue of *Tradition?* Here then Tradition must be given up; and the Council of *Trent* must have some other ground to go upon. For I think the Traditionary Men will not maintain the *vulgar Latin* to have been always *Authentick.*

2. That it referred the *making the Index of prohibited Books to the Pope*; and in the 4th *Rule* of that *Index, All Persons are forbidden the use of the Scripture in the vulgar Tongue, without a particular Licence, and whosoever presumes to doe it without a faculty, unless he first gives up his Bible, he is not to receive Absolution.*

My business is now to enquire what *Catholick Tradition* the Pope and Council went upon in this *Prohibition.* But as to the Testimony of Fathers, I am prevented by some late Discourses on this Subject. In stead thereof therefore I shall,

1. Shew from their own Writers, that there could be *no Catholick Tradition* for such a Prohibition.

2. Prove the General Consent of the Catholick Church from publick Acts, as to the free use of the Scripture.

Sum. 1. q. 1. a. 9. *Thomas Aquinas* grants *that the Scripture was proposed to all, and in such a manner that the most rude might understand it.* Therefore there was no Prohibition of such Persons reading it.

Cajetan there uses two Arguments for the Scriptures using *Metaphors and Similitudes.* 1. *Because God provides*

vides for all. 2. *Becauſe the Scripture is tendred to all. And the common People are not capable of underſtanding ſpiritual things without ſuch helps.* If the Scripture were intended for all, how comes a Prohibition of the uſe of it?

Sixtus Senenſis grants, *that in former times the Scripture was tranſlated into the vulgar Languages, and the People did commonly reade it, to their great Benefit.* Then a Prohibition of it muſt alter the Churches practical Tradition. Sixt. Senenſ. *Biblioth. l. 6. n. 152.*

Alphonſus à Caſtro yields to *Eraſmus, that the Scriptures were of old tranſlated into the vulgar Tongues, and that the Fathers, ſuch as S.* Chryſoſtom, *and S.* Jerom, *perſuaded People to the reading them. But the Caſe is altered now, when ſuch miſchief comes by the Reading the Scriptures.* And yet the Tradition of the Church continues the ſame, and is impoſſible to be changed. Alphonſ. à Caſtro, *l.* 1. *c.* 13.

Azorius puts the Caſe fairly; he grants *that the Scriptures were at firſt written and publiſhed in the Common Language; that S.* Chryſoſtom *admits all to reade the Scriptures; and that the People did ſo then; but they do not now.* But he ſaith, *the People then underſtood Greek and Latin, and now they do not.* If it were their own Language they might well underſtand it; but why ſhould not the Scripture now be in a Language they may underſtand? For *Greek* and *Latin* did not make the common People one jot wiſer or better; and yet this Man calls it *a Hereſie now to ſay, the Scriptures ought to be tranſlated into vulgar Languages.* How much is the Faith of the Church changed? Azor. *Inſtit. Moral. l.* 8. *c.* 26.

2. I am now to prove the General Conſent of the Catholick Church in this matter from *publick Acts, i. e.* that all Parts of it have agreed in *Tranſlations* of *Scripture* into *Vulgar Languages* without any ſuch *Prohibition.*

If

If there had been any ſuch thing in the Primitive Church, it would have held againſt the *Latin Tranſlation* it ſelf. For I hope none will ſay it was the *Original*, however *Authentick* it be made by the Council of *Trent*. How then came the Originals to be turned into the common Language? (as I ſuppoſe *Latin* will be allow'd to have been the common Language of the Roman Empire.) There is no Objection can now be made againſt any modern Tranſlations, but would have held againſt the firſt *Latin Verſion*. Who the Authour of it was is utterly unknown; and both S. *Auguſtin* and S. *Jerom* ſay, *there was a great variety among the old Tranſlations, and every one Tranſlated as he thought fit*. So that there was no reſtraint laid upon tranſlating into the common Language. And unleſs *Latin* were an infallible Guide to thoſe that underſtood it, the People were as liable to be deceived in it, as either in *Engliſh* or *French*.

Aug. *de Doct. Chriſtian. l.* 2. *c.* 11.
Hier. *Præf. in Joſuam.*

But it was not onely thus in the *Roman Empire*, but whereever a People were converted to Chriſtianity in all the elder times, the Scripture was turned into their Language. The Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians mention the *Converſion* of the *Goths*, and upon that, the *Tranſlation of the Bible into their Language by* Ulphilas *their Biſhop*. *Walafridus Strabo* adds to this, *that beſides the Bible, they had all publick Offices of Religion performed in their own Language*.

Soer. *l.* 4. *c.* 33.
Soz. *l.* 6. *c.* 37.
Nicep. *l.* 11. *c.* 48.
Iſid. *in Chron. Gothorum.*
Walaf. Strab. *de Reb. Eccl. c.* 7.

How ſoon the Churches in *Perſia* were planted, it is impoſſible for us now to know; but in the *MS. Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* of *Abulpharagius* (in the hands of Dr. *Loftus*) it is ſaid, *that a Diſciple of* Thaddæus *preached the Goſpel in* Perſia, Aſſyria *and the Parts thereabouts; and that by another Diſciple of his* 360 *Churches were ſettled there in his time; and that he came to* Seleucia, *the Metropolis of the Perſians, and there eſtabliſhed a Church, where*

where he continued fifteen years. And from him there was a Succeſſion of the Patriarchs of *Seleucia*, which continues ſtill in the Eaſt; for upon deſtruction thereof by *Almanſor*, they removed firſt to *Bagdad*, and after that to *Mozal* over againſt *Ninive*, where their reſidence hath been ſince; and this Patriarch had univerſal Juriſdiction over the *Eaſtern Churches* as far as the *Eaſt Indies*, as appears by *Morinus* his Books of *Ordinations* in the *Eaſt*, and the *proceedings* with the Chriſtians of St. *Thomas* in the very end of the *laſt Century*.

But we are certain from the Greek Hiſtorians, that in *Conſtantine*'s time the Chriſtians in *Perſia* were ſo numerous that he wrote to the *King* of *Perſia* on their behalf. *Euſebius* ſaith that *Conſtantine* was informed, *that the Churches were much increaſed there, and great Multitudes were brought into Chriſt's Flock*; and *Conſtantine* himſelf in his Letter to *Sapores* ſaith, *the Chriſtians flouriſhed in the beſt parts of* Perſia; *and he hoped they might continue ſo to doe.* But after *Conſtantine*'s death a terrible Perſecution befell them, wherein *Sozomen* ſaith, *the Names of* 16000 *Martyrs were preſerved, beſides an innumerable Multitude of unknown perſons.* The ſharpeſt part of the Perſecution fell upon the *Biſhops and Presbyters*; eſpecially in *Adiabene*, which was almoſt wholly Chriſtian, which *Ammianus Marcellinus* ſaith was the ſame with *Aſſyria*, wherein were *Ninive*, *Ecbatane*, *Arbela*, *Gaugamela*, *Babylon* (or *Seleucia*) and *Cteſiphon*, of which *Sozomen* ſaith, *Symeon* was then Archbiſhop. And he names above twenty Biſhops who ſuffered beſides, and one *Mareabdes* a *Chorepiſcopus*, with 250 of his Clergy. After the time of *Sapores* ſeveral ſharp Perſecutions fell upon thoſe Churches in the times of *Vararanes* and *Iſdigerdes*, of which the Greek Hiſtorians take notice, and one of them, ſaith *Theodoret*, laſted thirty years. This I mention to ſhew what

Euſeb. *de Vit. Conſt. l.* 4. *c.* 8.

c. 13.

Soz. *l.* 2. *c.* 14.

c. 12.

Ammianus Marcell. *l.* 23.

Soz. *l.* 2. *c.* 9.

Theod. *l.* 5. *c.* 39.

what mean thoughts those have of the *Catholick Church* who confine it to the Roman Communion. *Theodoret* and S. *Chrysostom* both affirm *that the Persians had the Scriptures then in their own Language*; and *Sozomen* saith, *that* Symeon *Archbishop of* Seleucia, *and* Ctesiphon *before his own Martyrdom, incouraged the rest to suffer out of the holy Scriptures.* Which supposes them well acquainted with the Language of it, and it is not very likely they should be either with the Hebrew, Greek or Latin; but the other Testimonies make it clear that it was in their own Tongue.

Theod. *de Cur. Græc. affect. Serm.* 5. *p.* 555. *Serm.* 9. *p.* 615. Chrys. *in* Joh. *Hom.* 2 *p.* 561.

The Anonymous Writer of S. *Chrysostom*'s Life affirms, *that while he staid in* Armenia, *he caused the New Testament to be translated into the Armenian Tongue for the benefit of those Churches.* And this Tradition is allow'd by several learned Men in the Church of *Rome.* But the *Armenians* themselves say, *the whole Bible was translated into the Armenian Language by* Moses Grammaticus, David *and* Mampræus, *three learned Men of their own, in the time of their Patriarch* Isaac, *about S.* Chrysostom's *time. Theodoret,* in the place already cited, mentions the *Armenian* Translation, as a thing well known; and he was near enough to understand the truth of it.

Vit. Chrys. *c.* 113.

Conc. Eccl. Armen. *cum* Rom. *c.* 7. *p.* 63.

Jacobus de Vitriaco, a Roman Cardinal, saith, *that the Armenians in his time had the Scriptures read to them in their own Language.*

Hist. Orient. c. 79.

The *Syriack Version* for the Use of those in the Eastern parts who understood not *Hebrew* or *Greek*, is allowed by all learned Men to have been very ancient. I mean the *old simple Version* out of the Originals, and not that out of the *LXX.* of the Old Testament. As to the New, the Tradition of the Eastern People is, *that it was done either in the Apostles times or very near them. Abraham Ecchellensis* shews, from the *Syriack* Writers, *that*

that the Compleat Translation of the Bible was made in the time of Abgarus, *King of* Edessa, *by the means of* Thaddæus *and the other Apostles*; and as to the time of *Thaddæus*, *Gregorius Malatiensis* confirms it. Abr. Ecchell. *not. in* Ebed. Jesu. Greg. *Hist. Dynast. 6.*

Postellus quotes an ancient Tradition (which my Adversaries ought to regard) *that S.* Mark *himself Translated not only his own Gospel, but all the Books of the New Testament into the Vulgar Syriack.* It is sufficient to my purpose, to shew that there was such an ancient *Translation*; which is owned by S. *Chrysostom*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Augustin*, *Diodorus* and *Theodoret*: which makes me wonder at Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s affirming with so much confidence, *that none of the Fathers speak of the Syriack Version*, when *Theodoret* alone mentions it so often in his Commentaries.

S. Chrysost. *hom.* 2. *in* Joh.
Ambros. *Hex.* 1. *c.* 8.
Aug. *de Civit. Dei, l.* 15. *c.* 13.
Diod. *ad* Gen. 27. 27.
Theod *in* Psal. 3. 4.
in Ps. 103. 26.
in Ps. 112. 1.
in Ps. 115.
De Verb. Dei, l. 2. *c.* 4.

Although the *Greeks* in *Egypt* might very well understand the *Greek* of the Old and New Testament, (especially if that which is called the *LXX.* were done by the *Alexandrian Jews*, as some imagine) yet those who knew no other than the old *Egyptian Language* could not make use of it. And therefore a *Coptick Translation* was made for them; which *Kircher* thinks *to have been* 1300 *years old.* And he withal observes, *that their ancient Liturgies were in the Coptick Language.* *Prodr. Copt. c.* 8.

That it might not be suspected that *Kircher* imposed upon the World, he gives a particular account of the Books he had seen in the *Vatican Library* and elsewhere in the *Coptick Tongue.* *The Pentateuch in three Tomes, distinguished into Paragraphs by lines. The four Gospels by themselves. S.* Paul's *Epistles and three Canonical Epistles with the Acts in another Volume. The Apocalypse by it self; and the Psalter. The Liturgy of S.* Mark *with*

other daily Prayers. The Liturgy of S. Gregory, *with the Prayers of S.* Cyril *in the Coptick Language; and a Liturgy of S.* Basil, *with* Gregory *and* Cyril, *with several other Rituals, Missals and Prayers, all in the same Tongue. All these,* he saith, *are in the Vatican Library.* And in
p. 186. that of the *Maronites College,* he saith, is *an old Coptick Martyrology about* 1300 *years standing, by which he finds, that the chief imployment of the old Egyptian Monks was to translate the Bible out of Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek into the Coptick Tongue.*

Dissert. Epist. 13. *Morinus* saith, *that in the Oratorian Library at* Paris, *they had the Coptick Gospels brought from* Constantinople *by* Monsr. de Sancy.

Epist. 14. *Petrus à Valle,* a Nobleman of *Rome,* and a great Traveller, saith *he had several parts of Scripture in the Coptick Language; which were turned into Arabick, when the old Coptick grew into disuse.*

Hottinger. Methurgem. *p.* 189. *Petræus* had in the Eastern Parts *a Coptick Psalter, with an Arabick Version, which he designed to publish.*

The Congregation *de propaganda Fide* at *Rome* had several *Coptick MS S.* sent to them out of *Egypt,* among the rest the *Coptick Book* of *Ordination* Transloatd and Printed by *Kircher*; and since reprinted by *Morinus.*

De Ordinat. sacris, p. 504. *Catal. MS S. p.* 31. *Seguier* the late *Chancellour* of *France* had in his Library, the *Consecration* of a Patriarch in *Coptick* and *Arabick, and several Translations of the Bible, and Prayers in both Languages.*

Ludolph. *Hist.* Æthiop. *l.* 3. *c.* 4. The *Æthiopick Translation* bears date with the *Conversion* of the Nation, according to their own Tradition, which some make to be in the *Apostolical times*, and others in the time of *Constantine*; and their *Publick Offices* are performed in their own Tongue. The Chancellour *Seguier* had not only many parts of the Bible, but *Prayers* and *Offices* in the *Æthiopick Tongue.*

I shall

I ſhall add but one thing more to this purpoſe, which is taken from the want of Antiquity in the *Arabick Verſions*; which is confeſſed by the learned Criticks on all ſides. And even this tends to prove my deſign. For when the *Saracen* Empire prevailed, the People grew more acquainted with the *Arabick* than with the ancient *Syriack* or *Coptick*; and therefore the Scripture was then tranſlated into *Arabick*; (as *Vaſæus* ſaith it was done in *Spain* after the Moors came thither by a Biſhop of *Sevil*) and this was the true reaſon why the *Arabick Verſions* have no greater Antiquity. For *Gabriel Sionita* obſerves *that the Arabick is become the moſt Vulgar Language in the Eaſtern Parts.* And becauſe it was ſo in *Syria* as well as *Egypt*, therefore there are different *Arabick Verſions*; the one called *Codex Antiochenus*, and the other *Alexandrinus*. Gabr. Sionita de Arab. c. 12.

Thus I have proved that there was a *Catholick Tradition* directly contrary to that eſtabliſhed by order of the Council of *Trent*.

And now I proceed to give an Account of the *Methods* and *Steps by which* this Decree came to its ripeneſs.

1. The firſt *Step* was the *Declenſion* and *Corruption* of the *Latin Tongue* in the *Weſtern Church*. It is obſerved by *Polybius, that from the time of the firſt League between the Romans and Carthaginians, the Latin Tongue was ſo much changed even in* Rome *it ſelf that very few could underſtand the Words of it.* And *Feſtus* in *Latine loqui* ſaith, *that the Language was ſo alter'd, that ſcarce any part of it remained entire. Scaliger* thinks *theſe words were added to* Feſtus *by* Paulus Diaconus; which ſeems much more probable, ſince he lived in the time of *Charlemagn.* At which time we may eaſily ſuppoſe the *Latin Tongue* to have been very much corrupted by the Writers, and Polyb. l. 3.

not ſo eaſie to be underſtood any where by the Common People in ſudden Diſcourſe, as it had been before. Which appears evident by the *Latin Sermons* made to the People in the ſeveral Provinces in the *Roman Empire*; as in *Africa* by S. *Auguſtin* and *Fulgentius*; in *Italy* by *Petrus Chryſologus*, *Laurentius Novarienſis*, *Gaudentius Brixienſis*, *Ennodius Ticinenſis*: In *Spain* by *Iſidore*, *Ildephonſus* and others: In *Gaul* by *Cæſarius*, *Eucherius*, *Eligius*, and ſeveral others, whoſe Latin Sermons to the People are ſtill extant. In the Council of *Tours*, in the time of *Charlemagn*, particular care is taken *that the Homilies ſhould be tranſlated by their Biſhops either into the Ruſtick Roman or the German, that the People might the eaſier underſtand them.* Theſe Homilies were either thoſe which *Charlemagn* cauſed to be taken out of the *Fathers*, and applied to the ſeveral Leſſons through the year, as *Sigebert* obſerves, or of their own compoſing; however they were to be turned by the Biſhops either into *Ruſtick Roman*, or *German*, as ſerved beſt to the capacities of the People. For the *Franks* then either retained the *Original German*, or uſed the *Ruſtick Roman*; but this latter ſo much prevailed over the other, that in the ſolemn Oaths between *Lewis* and *Charles* upon parting the Dominions of *France* and *Germany*, ſet down in *Nithardus*, the *Ruſtick Roman* was become the *Vulgar Language* of *France*, and theſe were but the Grandchildren of *Charlemagn*. *Marquardus Freherus* thinks *that onely the Princes and Great Men retained the German, but the generality then ſpake the Ruſtick Roman*; as appears by the Oath of the People; which begins thus.

Si Lodhuigs Sacrament que Son Fradre Carlo jurat conſervat, & Carlus meo Serdra de ſuo part non los tanit, ſi jo returnar non lucit pois, ne io, ne neuls cui eo returnar nil pois, in nulla adjudha contra Lodwig nun li iver.

Conc. Turon. 3. *c.* 17.

Sigeb. *ad An.* 807.

Nithard. *l.* 3.

Freher. *in Expoſit. Fœderis inter* Lud. & Car.

V. Capitul. Caroli Calvi. *Tit.* 8.

By

By which we may ſee what a mixture of *Latin* there was in the *vulgar Language* then uſed by the *Franks*, and how eaſie it was for the People then to underſtand the *publick Offices* being conſtant; but the *Sermons* not being ſo, there was greater neceſſity to turn them into that corrupt or *Ruſtick Roman*, which was thoroughly underſtood by them. In *Spain* the *Latin* was leſs corrupted before the *Gothick* and *Arabick* or *Mooriſh* Words were taken into it. *Lucius Marineus* ſaith, *that had it not been for the mixture of thoſe words, the Spaniards had ſpoken as good Latin as the Romans did in the time of* Tully: and he ſaith, *that to his time he had ſeen Epiſtles written in Spaniſh, wherein all the Nouns and Verbs were good Latin.* In *Italy* the Affinity of the vulgar prevailing Language and the *Latin* continued ſo great, that the difference ſeemed for ſome hundred years, no more than of the learned and common *Greek*, or of the *Engliſh* and *Scotch*; and ſo no neceſſity was then apprehended of Tranſlating the correct Tongue into a corrupt Dialect of it.

Marineus Sicul. *de Rebus Hiſp. l.* 5. *f.* 4.

But where there was a plain difference of Language there was ſome care even then taken, that the People might underſtand what they heard, as appears by theſe things:

1. *Alcuinus* gives an Account why one day was called *Sabbatum in* 12 *Lectionibus*, when there were but *ſix Leſſons*, and he ſaith, *it was becauſe they were read both in Greek and Latin, they not underſtanding each others Languages.* Not becauſe the *Greek* was a holy Tongue, but *quia aderant Græci, quibus ignota erat lingua Latina*; which ſhews that the Church then thought it a reaſonable cauſe to have the Scripture in ſuch a Language, which might be underſtood by the People. The ſame Reaſon is given by *Amalarius*.

Alchuin. *de divin. Offic. c.* 29.

Amalar. *de Offic. l.* 2. *c.* 1.

2. In

2. In the *German Churches* there were ancient *Translations* of Scripture into their own Language. *B. Rhenanus* attributes a Translation of the Gospels to *Waldo* Bishop of *Freising*, *assoon as the* Franks *received Christianity*, and he saith, *it was the immortal Honours of the* Franks, *to have the Scripture so soon translated into their own Language*; *which*, saith he, *is of late opposed by some Divines*: So little did he know of an universal Tradition against it. *Goldastus* mentions the Translation in Rhime by *Ottfridus Wissenburgensis*, published by *Achilles Gassarus*, the Psalter of *Notkerus*, *Rudolphus ab Eems* his *Paraphrase* of the *old Testament*. *Andreas du Chesn* hath published a Preface before an old *Saxon Book*, wherein it is said, *that* Ludovicus Pius *did take care that all the People should read the Scripture in their own Tongue, and gave it in charge to a* Saxon *to translate both Old and New Testament into the* German *Language*; *which*, saith he, *was performed very elegantly*.

Rhenan. Rer. German. p. 112.

Rer. Alem. To. 1. p. 120. To. 2. p. 119.

Hist. Franc. To. 2. p. 326.

3. In the *Saxon Churches* here, it was not to be expected that the Scripture should be translated, till there were Persons learned both in the *Saxon* and the other Languages. *Bede*, in his Epistle to *Egbert*, puts him upon instructing the common People in their own Language, especially in the Creed and Lord's Prayer; and to further so good a Work, *Bede* himself translated *the Gospel of St.* John *into the* Saxon *Tongue*, as *Cuthbert* saith in the Epistle about his Death, in the Life of *Bede*, before his *Saxon History*. It appears by the old *Canons* of *Churches*, and the *Epistles* of *Ælfric*, saith Mr. *Lisle*, *that there was an old* Saxon *Canon for the Priest to say unto the People the sense of the Gospel in* English; and *Ælfric* saith of himself, *that he had translated the Pentateuch, and some of the Historical Books*. The New Testament was translated by several hands; and an ancient *Saxon* Translation hath been

Bed. *Epist. ad* Egbert, p. 65.

Saxon *Treatise of the Old and New Testament.*

been lately publiſhed with the *Gothick Goſpels*. And there were old *Saxon Gloſſes* upon the *Goſpels*; of *Aldred*, *Farmen* and *Owen*. The laſt Work of K. *Alfred* was the *tranſlating* the *Pſalter*; and if the MS. Hiſtory of *Ely* deſerves credit, *he tranſlated both the Old and New Teſtament.*

4. It is not denied either by *Bellarmin* or *Baronius*, *that* the Slavonians *in the 9th Century had a permiſſion upon their converſion to Chriſtianity, to enjoy the Bible, and to have publick Offices performed in their own Language.* But they tell us, *it was becauſe they were then Children in the Faith, and to be indulged*; (but methinks Children were the moſt in danger to be ſeduced;) *or there were not Prieſts enough to officiate in Latin at firſt*: But this was no Reaſon then given, as appears by the Pope's own Letter publiſhed by *Baronius*, Wherein *he gives God thanks for the Invention of Letters among them by* Conſtantine *a Philoſopher*; and he expreſly ſaith, *that God had not confined his Honour to three Languages, but all People and Languages were to praiſe him*; and he ſaith, *God himſelf in Scripture had ſo commanded*; *and he quotes St.* Paul's *words for it.* One would wonder thoſe great Men ſhould no better conſider the Popes own Reaſons; but give others for him, which he never thought of. It is true, he adds, *that he would have the Goſpel read firſt in Latin, and then in Salvonian, and if they pleaſed he would have the Maſs ſaid in Latin*; but the *Slavonians* continued their Cuſtom, and the Pope was willing enough to let them enjoy it, for his own convenience as well as theirs. For there was a ſecret in this matter, which is not fully underſtood.

Bell. *de Verbo Dei, l.* 2. Bar. *ad An* 880. *n.* 16.

Aventinus, ſaith, *that* Methodius *invented their Letters, and tranſlated the Scriptures into the* Slavonian *Tongue, and perſuaded the People to reject the Latin Service*; but this I ſee no ground for. But the Truth of the matter

Aventin. *Annal. l.* 4. *p.* 424.

matter was, the *Slavonians* were converted by the means of *Methodius* and *Cyril*, (otherwiſe called *Conſtantine*) two *Greek Biſhops*, and the Chriſtian Religion was ſettled among them by their means, and they Tranſlated the Scriptures and Offices of Worſhip into their own Language. The Pope had not forgotten the buſineſs of the *Bulgarians*, and he could not tell but this might end in ſubjection to another *Patriarchal See*; and therefore he endeavours to get *Methodius* and *Cyril* to *Rome*, and having gained them, he ſends a ſweetning Letter to the Prince, and makes the conceſſion before mentioned. For he could not but remember how very lately the *Greeks* had gained the *Bulgarians* from him; and leſt the *Slavonians* ſhould follow them, he was content to let them have what they deſired, and had already Eſtabliſhed among themſelves, without his Permiſſion. All this appears from the account of this matter given by *Conſtantinus Porphyrogenetus*, compared with *Diocleas* his *Regnum Slavorum*, and *Lucius* his *Dalmatian Hiſtory*.

Bar. A. 869. *n.* 80.

It is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that *Diocleas* owns that *Conſtantine* (to whom *Andreas Dandalus*, D. of *Venice*, in his *M S. Hiſtory* cited by *Lucius*, ſaith, *the Pope gave the name of* Cyril) *did Tranſlate the Bible into the* Slavonian *Tongue, for the benefit of the People, and the publick Offices out of Greek, according to their Cuſtom.* And the Chancellour *Seguier* had in his Library both the *New Teſtament* and *Liturgies* in the *Slavonian Language*, *and in* Cyril's *Character*; and many of the *Greek Fathers* Commentaries on Scripture in that Tongue, but not one of the Latin.

Luci. *de Regno* Dalmatiæ, *l.* 2. *c.* 3.

Catal. M S S. p. 33, 34.

Greg. *Regiſt. l.* 7. *Ep.* 11.

2. The next ſtep was, *when* Gregory 7. *prohibited the Tranſlation of the Latin Offices in the* Slavonian *Tongue.* And this he did to the King of *Bohemia* himſelf, after a perempto-

peremptory manner; but he saith, *it was the request of the Nobility, that they might have divine Offices in the* Slavonian *Tongue, which he could by no means yield to.* What was the matter? How comes the Case to be so much altered from what it was in his Predecessor's time? The true Reason was, the *Bohemian Churches* were then brought into greater Subjection to the Roman See, after the Consecration of *Dithmarus Saxo* to be their Archbishop; and now they must own their Subjection, as the Roman Provinces were wont to do, by receiving the Language. But as his Predecessour had found Scripture for it, for *Gregory* pretends he had found Reason against it, viz. *The Scripture was obscure, and apt to be misunderstood and despised.* What! more than in the time of *Methodius* and *Cyril?* If they pleaded Primitive Practice, he plainly answers, *that the Church is grown wiser, and hath corrected many things that were then allowed.* This is indeed to the purpose; and therefore by the Authority of S. *Peter, he forbids him to suffer any such thing, and charges him to oppose it with all his might.*

Cum primitiva Ecclesia multa dissimulaverit quæ à sanctis Patribus postmodum firmata Christianitate, & Religione crescente, subtili examinatione correcta sunt.

But after all, it is entred in the Canon Law *De Officio Jud. Ord. l.* 1. *Tit.* 31. *c. Quoniam,* as a Decree of *Innocent* 3. in the *Lateran Council, that where there were People of different Languages, the Bishop was to provide Persons fit to officiate in those several Languages.* Why so? If there were a prohibition of using any but the Latin Tongue. *But this was for the Greeks, and theirs was an holy Tongue.* That is not said; nor if it were would it signifie any thing; for doth any imaginary holiness of the Tongue sanctifie ignorant Devotion? *But the Canon supposes them to have the same Faith.* Then the meaning is, that no man must examin his Religion by the Scrip-

ture, but if he reſolves beforehand to believe as the Church believes, then he may have the Scriptures or Prayers in what Language he pleaſes. But even this is not permitted in the Roman Church. For,

3. After the *Inquiſition* was ſet up by the Authority of *Innocent* 3. in the *Lateran Council*, no Lay Perſons were permitted to have the Books of the Old and New Teſtament, but the *Pſalter*, or *Breviary*, or *Hours*, they might have; but by no means in the *vulgar Language*. This is called by *D'achery* and *Labbe* the *Council* of *Thouſe*, but in truth it was nothing elſe but an *Order* of the *Inquiſition*, as will appear to any one that reads it. And the *Inquiſition* ought to have the Honour of it, both in *France* and *Spain*. Which *Prohibition* hath been ſo grateſull to ſome Divines of the Church of *Rome*, that *Cochlæus* calls it *pious, juſt, reaſonable, wholſom* and *neceſſary*; *Andradius* thinks the *taking of it away would be deſtructive to Faith*; *Ledeſma* ſaith, *the true Catholicks do not deſire it, and had ought not to be gratified with it.* *Petrus Sutor*, a *Carthuſian Doctour*, calls the Tranſlating Scripture into the vulgar Languages, *a raſh, uſeleſs and dangerous thing*; and he gives the true Reaſon of it, viz. *that the People will be apt to murmur when they ſee things required as from the Apoſtles, which they cannot find a word of in Scripture.* And when all is ſaid on this Subject that can be, by men of more Art, this is the plaineſt and honeſteſt Reaſon for ſuch a *Prohibition*; but I hope I have made it appear it is not built on any *Catholick Tradition*.

Labb. *Concil. To.* 11. *p.* 427.

Cochl. *c.* Alex. Aleſium, *A. D.* 1533.

Andrad. *Defenſ. Concil.* Trident. *l.* 4.

Ledeſma *de Div. Script. quavis lingua non leg. p.* 155.

Pet. Sutor *de Tralatione Bibliæ, p.* 99. *p.* 96.

IV. Of

IV. Of the Merit of Good Works.

The Council of *Trent Seſſ. 6. c. 16.* declares, *That the Good Works of juſtified Perſons do truly deſerve Eternal Life*; and *Can. 32.* an *Anathema* is *denounced againſt him that denies them to be meritorious, or that a juſtified Perſon by them doth not truly merit Increaſe of Grace, and Happineſs, and Eternal Life.*

The *Council* hath not thought fit to declare what it means by *truly meriting*; but certainly it muſt be oppoſed to an improper kind of Meriting, and what that is we muſt learn from the *Divines* of the Church of *Rome.*

1. Some ſay, That ſome of the Fathers ſpeak of an *improper* kind of Merit, which is no more than the due Means for the attaining of Happineſs as the End: So *Vega* confeſſes they often uſe the word *Merit*, where there is no Reaſon for *Merit*, either by way of *Congruity* or *Condignity*. Therefore, where there is true Merit there muſt be a proper Reaſon for it. And the Council of *Trent* being deſigned to condemn ſome prevailing Opinions at that time, among thoſe they called *Hereticks*, this Aſſertion of *true Merit* muſt be levelled againſt ſome Doctrine of theirs; but they held *Good Works* to be *neceſſary* as *Means* to an end, and therefore this could not be the meaning of the Council.

Vega *de Juſtif. l. 8. c. 8.*

Suarez ſaith, *the words of the Council ought to be ſpecially obſerved, which are, that there is nothing wanting in the good works of juſtified* Perſons, ut vere promeruiſſe cenſeantur; *and therefore no Metaphorical or improper, but that which by the Senſe of the Church of* Rome *was accounted true Merit in oppoſition to what was ſaid by thoſe accounted Hereticks muſt be underſtood thereby.*

Suarez *de Grat. l. 12. c. 1 n. 8.*

2. Others ſay, that a *meer Congruity* ariſing from the Promiſe and Favour of God in rewarding the acts of his Grace in juſtified Perſons cannot be the *proper Merit* intended by the Council. And that for theſe Reaſons.

Suarez *de Grat. l.* 12. *c.* 1. *n.* 12.

1. *Suarez* obſerves that although the Council avoids the Terms *ex Condigno*, yet becauſe it ſtill uſes the words *vere mereri*, it implies ſomething more than *mere Congruity*; and becauſe it ſpeaks of *meriting the Increaſe of Grace, and not the firſt Grace*; now a *Congruity* is allowed for the *firſt Grace*, which it excludes by mentioning *the Increaſe*. And withal, it brings places to prove *that the giving the Reward muſt be a Retribution of Juſtice, and if ſo, the merit muſt be more than that of Congruity.*

2. Becauſe *God*'s *Promiſe* doth not give any *Intrinſick value* to the Nature of the Act; no more than his threatning doth increaſe the Nature of Guilt. If the King of *Perſia* had promiſed a Province to him that gave him a draught of Water, the Act it ſelf had been no more *meritorious*; but it only ſhewed the Munificence of the Prince; no more do God's Promiſes of Eternal Life add any merit to the Acts of Grace, but onely ſet forth the Infinite Bounty of the Promiſer.

Diſputat. Ratisbonæ *An.* 1546. *p.* 568.

3. In the Conference at *Ratisbon* (the year this Decree paſſed) by the Emperour's Order the Proteſtant Party did yield, *that by virtue of God's Promiſe the Reward of Eternal Life was due to juſtified Perſons; as a Father promiſing a great Reward to his Son for his pains in ſtudying, makes it become due to him, although there be no proportion between them. And if no more were meant by Merit of Congruity, than that it was very agreeable to the Divine Nature to reward the Acts of his own Grace with an infinite Reward, they would yield this too.*

4. Car-

4. Cardinal *Pallavicini* gives us the plain and true meaning of the Council, *viz. that a Merit* de Congruo *was allowed for Works before Justification; but for Works after, they all agreed,* he saith; *that there was a Merit* de condigno *in them both for increase of Grace and Eternal Glory.* By Merit *de condigno* is meant such an *intrinsick value* in the nature of the Act as makes the Reward in Justice to be due to it. *Hist. Conc. Trid. l. 8. c. 4. n. 4.*

Some call one of these, *Meritum secundum quid*; which is the same with *de congruo;* which really deserves no reward, but receives it onely from the liberality of the Giver; and this hath not *truly*, say they, *the notion of Merit*; but that which makes *the reward due* is *simple and true Merit*, when it doth not come merely from the Kindness of the Giver, but from Respect to the worthiness of the Action and the Doer, and this is *de condigno.* Rich. *de Media. Vill. in l. 2. sent. dist. 17. art. 2. q. 1.* Nich. de Orbellis *in 3. sent. dist. 27.*

Let us now see what *Catholick Tradition* there was for this Doctrine, and whether this were taught them by their *Fathers* in a continued succession down from the Apostles times.

But that there was a change as to the sense of the Church in this matter, I shall prove in the first place from an *Office* which was allow'd in the Church before, and forbidden after. It was an *Office* with respect to *dying Persons*, wherein are these Questions.

Q. *Dost thou believe that thou shalt come to Heaven, not by thy own Merits, but by the virtue and Merit of Christ's Passion?*

A. *I do believe it.*

Q. *Dost thou believe that Christ died for our Salvation, and that none can be saved by their own Merits, or any other way but by the Merits of his Passion?*

A. *I do believe it.*

Credis non propriis meritis, sed passionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi virtute & merito ad gloriam pervenire?

Credo.

Credis quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus pro Salute nostra mortuus sit; & quod ex propriis meritis, vel alio modo nullus posset salvari nisi in merito passionis ejus?

Credo.

Now

Now when the *Indices Expurgatorii* were made in purſuance to the Order of the *Council* of *Trent*, this paſſage was no longer endured. For, in the *Roman Index* the *Ordo baptizandi*, wherein this Queſtion was, is forbidden till it were Corrected. But the *Spaniſh Indices* explain the myſtery; that of Cardinal *Quiroga* ſaith expreſly, *thoſe Queſtions and Anſwers muſt be blotted out*; and the like we find in the *Index* of *Soto major* and *Sandoval*. What now is the Reaſon, that ſuch Queſtions and Anſwers were no longer permitted, if the Churches Tradition continued ſtill the ſame? Was not this a way to know the Tradition of the Church by the *Offices* uſed in it? This was no *private Office* then firſt uſed, but although the prohibition mentions one Impreſſion at *Venice* (as though there had been no more) I have one before me, Printed by *Gryphius* at *Venice* two years before that; and long before with the *Præceptorium* of *Lyra*, *A. D.* 1495. where the Queſtion to the dying Perſon is in theſe words, *Si credit ſe Merito Paſſionis Chriſti & non propriis ad gloriam pervenire? Et reſpondeat, Credo.* And the ſame Queſtions and Anſwers I have in a *Sacerdotale Romanum* Printed by *Nicolinus* at *Venice* 1585. Cardinal *Hoſius* ſays that he had ſeen theſe *Queſtions and Anſwers* in the *Sacerdotale Romanum* and in the *Hortulus Animæ*; and that they were believed to be firſt preſcribed by *Anſelm*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. On what account now, come theſe things to be prohibited and expunged, if the Churches *Doctrine* and *Tradition* about this matter, be ſtill the very ſame? No doubt it was believed that the Council of *Trent* had now ſo far declared the Senſe of the Church another way, that ſuch *Queſtions* and *Anſwers* were no longer to be endured.

Hoſ. *Confeſſ.* Petricovi, *c.* 72. *p.* 144.

But before the *Council* of *Trent* the *Canons* of *Colen* againſt *Hermannus* their Biſhop, when he publiſhed his *Refor-*

Antididagma Colon. *f.* 16. 2.

Reformation, declare, that God's giving Eternal Life upon good Works is *ex gratuita dignatione ſuæ clementiæ*, from the Favour which God vouchſafes to them. Which to my apprehenſion is inconſiſtent with the Notion of *true Merit* in the Works themſelves; for if there be any *Condignity* in them, it cannot be mere Grace and Favour in God to reward them.

The ſame Canons in their *Enchiridion* ſome years before, when they joyned with their *Biſhop*, call it *ſtupidity to think that good Works are rewarded with Eternal Life for any Dignity in the Works themſelves*. And if there be no dignity in them, there can be no true *Merit*; as the Council of *Trent* determines with an *Anathema*. *Enchirid.* Colon. *f.* 176. 2.

Pope *Adrian* VI. gives ſuch an account of the *Merit* of our *Works*, that he could never imagine any *condignity* in them to *Eternal Life*. *For*, ſaith he, *our Merits are a broken reed, which pierce the hand of him that leans upon them; they are a menſtruous Cloth, and our beſt Actions mixt with impurities; and when we have done all that we can, we are unprofitable Servants.* Adrian. *de Sacr. Eucbar. f.* 61.

Petrus *de Alliaco* Cardinal of *Cambray* attributes no other effect to good Works than of *Cauſa ſine qua non*; and ſaith *that the Reward is not to be attributed to any Virtue in them, but to the Will of the Giver*. Which I think overthrows any *true Merit*. Pet de Alliaco, *in* 4. *l. Sent. q.* 1. *art.* 1. *f.* 225. 1.

Gabriel Biel attributes *the Merit of Good Works* not to any *intrinſecal Goodneſs in them*, but to *God's acceptation*. Which is in words to aſſert *Merit*, and in truth to deny it; for, how can there be true Merit in the Works, if all their value depends upon divine Acceptance? Biel *in l.* 2. *ſent. diſt.* 27. *art.* 1. *not.* 3.

Thomas Walden charges *Wickliff* with aſſerting *the Doctrine of Merit and incouraging men to truſt in their own Righteouſneſs*, and he quotes *Scripture* and *Fathers* againſt Walden. *de Sacram. Tit.* 2. *c.* 7.

againſt it; and he blames the uſe of the term of *Merit* either *ex congruo* or *ex condigno*: which he ſaith *was an Invention of ſome late Schoolmen, and was contrary to the ancient Doctrine of the Church.* As he proves, not only from *Scripture* and *Fathers*, but from the *ancient Offices* too: as in the *Canon* of the *Maſs*, *Non æſtimator meriti, ſed veniæ quæſumus largitor, &c.* Fer. 4. Paſſ. *Ut qui de meritorum qualitate diffidimus, non judicium tuum ſed miſericordiam conſequamur.* Dom. 2. Adv. *Ubi nulla ſuppetunt ſuffragia meritorum, tuæ nobis indulgentiæ ſuccurre præſidiis.* How comes the Doctrine condemned in *Wickliff* to be eſtabliſhed in the *Council of Trent?* For he was blamed for aſſerting *true Merit*, and the *Council* aſſerts it with an *Anathema* to thoſe that deny it. And yet we muſt believe the very ſame *Tradition* to have been in the Church all this while.

Vega *in Opuſc. Qu.* 4. *Vega* ſaith, *that* Walden *ſpeaks againſt Merits without Grace*; but any one that reads him will find it otherwiſe, For he produces thoſe paſſages out of the *Fathers* againſt *Merits* which do ſuppoſe *Divine Grace*, as it were eaſie to ſhew; but Friar *Walden* thought the notion of *Merit* inconſiſtent with the *Power* and *Influence* of *Divine Grace* neceſſary to our beſt Actions. *God*, ſaith he, *doth not regard Merit either as to Congruity or Condignity, but his own Grace, and Will, and Mercy.*

Marſil. *in l.* 2. *ſent. q.* 18. *Marſilius de Ingen* who lived before *Walden* reckons up *three Opinions* about *Merit*; *the firſt of thoſe who denied it*, and of this, ſaith he, *Durandus* ſeems to be, and one *Joh. de Everbaco.* The ſecond of *thoſe who ſaid that our Works have no merit of themſelves, but as informed by divine Grace, and from the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, ſo they do truly merit Eternal Life*, and of this Opinion he ſaith was *Thomas de Argentina.* The third was, of thoſe who granted *that true Merit doth imply an Equality,*

lity, but then they distinguish Equality, as to Quantity and as to Proportion, and in this latter sense they asserted an Equality. And of this Opinion he saith was *Petrus de Tarantasia.* But he delivers his own Judgment in these Conclusions.

1. *That our Works either considered in themselves or with Divine Grace are not meritorious of Eternal Life* ex condigno, which he proves both from *Scripture* and *Reason, viz.* because 1. *No Man can make God a Debtor to him; for the more Grace he hath the more he is a Debtor to God. And* 2. *He cannot merit of another by what he receives from him. And* 3. *No man can pay what he owes to God, and therefore can never merit at his hands.* 4. *No man can merit here so much Grace as to keep him from falling away from Grace; much less then Eternal Life.*

2. *These works may be said to be meritorious of Eternal Life* ex condigno *by divine acceptation originally proceeding from the Merit of Christ's Passion, because that makes them worthy.* But this is *Christ's Merit* and not the *true Merit* of our Works.

3. *Works done by Grace do merit Eternal Life* de congruo *from God's liberal disposition, whereby he hath appointed so to reward them. It beeing agreeable to him to give Glory to them that love him.* But this is an improper kind of *Merit,* and can by no means support the Tradition of *true Merit.*

Durandus utterly denies any *true Merit* of Man towards God; he doth not deny it in a *large improper sense* for such a *Condignity* in our actions as God hath appointed in order to a Reward; which is by the Grace of God in us; but as it is taken for *a free Action to which a Reward is in Justice due; because whatever we doe is more owing to the Grace of God than to our selves; but to make a Debtor to us, we must not only pay an equivalent*

Durand. *in sent. l. 2. dist.* 27. *q.* 2.

to what we owe, but we must go beyond it; but to God and our Parents we can never pay an equivalent, much less exceed it. And we can never merit by what God gives us, n. 14. *because the Gift lays a greater Obligation upon us.* And he saith, *the holding the contrary is temerarious and blasphemous.*

The two grounds of holding Merit were, the *supposing a Proportion between Grace and Glory, and an Equality between Divine Grace and Glory in Vertue, Grace being as the Seed of Glory*; and to both these he answers.

To the first, *That the giving a Reward upon Merit is no part of distributive, but commutative Justice, because it respects the relation of one thing to another, and not the mere quality of the Person.*

To the second, *That the Value of an Act is not considered with respect to the first Mover, but to the immediate Agent: and as to Grace being the seed of Glory, it is but a metaphorical expression, and nothing can be drawn from it.* So that *Durandus* concludes *true Merit* with respect to God to be *temerarious, blasphemous and impossible.*

Ockam *in* 4. *sent. q.* 3. *ad secundum. In. l.* 1. *dist.* 17. *q.* 1. *in l.* 1. *dist.* 17. *q.* 2. *Ockam* declares, *That after all our good Works God may without Injustice deny Eternal Life to them who do them; because God can be Debtor to none; and therefore whatever he doth to us, it is out of mere Grace. And that there can be nothing meritorious in any act of ours, but from the Grace of God freely accepting it.* And therefore he must deny any *true Merit.*

Greg. Arim. *in l.* 1. *sent. dist.* 17. *art.* 2. *Gregorius Ariminensis* saith, *That no Act of ours though coming from Grace to never so great a degree, is meritorious with God* ex condigno *of any Reward either Temporal or Eternal; because every such Act is a Gift of God; and if it were at all meritorious, yet not as to Eternal Life, because there is no equivalency between them, and therefore*

fore it cannot in Justice be due to it; and consequently if God gives it, he must do it freely. But, saith he, *God is said to be just, when he gives* bona pro bonis, *and merciful, when he gives* bona pro malis; *not but that he is merciful in both, but because his mercy appears more in the latter; and in the other, it seems like justice in a general sense from the conformity of the Merit and the Reward; but in this particular retribution it is mere Mercy.*

Scotus affirms, *that all the meritoriousness of our Acts depends on divine Acceptation in order to a Reward; and if it did depend on the intrinsick worth of the Acts, God could not in justice deny the Reward; which is false; and therefore it wholly depends on the good will and favour of God.* Scot. *in l.* 1. *sent. dist.* 17. *q* 3. *n* 24.

Bellarmin is aware of this, and he confesses this to be the Opinion of *Scotus* and of other old Schoolmen. But how then do they hold the Doctrine and Tradition of *true Merit? He holds that good Works are properly and truly good.* So do we, and yet deny *Merit.* But he grants, *that he denies that they bear any proportion to Eternal Life,* and therefore they cannot be *truly meritorious* of it. *Bellarmin* himself asserts *that without the divine Promise good Works have a proportion to Eternal Life,* and this he saw was necessary to defend the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*; but then he adds, *that there is no obligation on God's part to reward in such a manner without a Promise.* Now here are two hard Points, 1. To make it appear that there is such a meritoriousness in good Works *without a Divine Promise.* 2. That if there were so, there is *no Obligation on God* to reward such Acts in point of *Justice.* The former is so much harder to do from what he had proved before, *c.* 14. viz. *that they are not meritorious without a Promise;* Bell. *de Just. l.* 5. *c.* 17.

and here he proves *that they have no proportion to the Reward, from Scripture, Fathers and Reaſon; becauſe there is no Obligation on God to do it, either from commutative or diſtributive juſtice; and becauſe we are God's Servants.* Theſe are good Arguments againſt himſelf for how can ſuch Acts then become *meritorious* without a Promiſe? If there be no proportion or *equality* on Man's part, no Juſtice on God's part to reward, how can they poſſibly be *meritorious?* But this is too deep for me to comprehend. My buſineſs is *Tradition*, and I have evidently proved that there was no *Tradition* even in the Church of *Rome* for the *true Merit* defined by the *Council* of *Trent*. It were eaſie to carry this point higher, by ſhewing that the *Fathers* knew nothing of this *Doctrine*, but that hath been done by many already, and it is needleſs in ſo plain a caſe.

But I am now to give an account by what *Steps* and *Occaſions* this Doctrine came to be eſtabliſhed.

Joſ. Scalig. *in* Varr. *de L.L.* p. 172. Bud. *in Pandect. pag.* 362. Plin. *ep. l.* 1. 8.

1. From the common Uſe of the word *Merit* with the *Fathers* and others, in another ſenſe than it ſignified at firſt. The original ſignification of it is *Wages* paid in conſideration of *Service*; and from thence *Souldiers were ſaid* merere (as *Budæus* obſerves, and thence came the word *merces*) who truly deſerved their pay by their labour and hazard; but by degrees it came to ſignifie no more than *merely to attain a thing*; which is ſometimes uſed by good Authors; but in the declenſion of the Latin Tongue no ſenſe of this word was more common than this, eſpecially among *Eccleſiaſtical Writers.* Who frequently uſed it in a ſenſe wherein it was impoſſible to underſtand it in its original ſignification; and it cannot imply ſo much as *digne conſequi*, as in the inſtance brought by *Caſſander*; when St. *Cyprian* renders thoſe words of St. *Paul, Miſericordiam merui*, which we render

Caſſand. *in Hymn. Eccl.* p. 179.

render, *Iobtained Mercy*; but the Council of *Trent* allows there could be no true *Merit* here. And St. *Auguſtin* ſaith of thoſe who murdered the Son of God, *Illi veniam meruerunt qui Chriſtum occiderunt.* And ſo the vulgar Latin often uſes it, *Gen.* 4. 13. *major eſt iniquitas mea quam ut veniam merear.* Joſ. 11. 20. *& non mererentur ullam Clementiam.* And in that ſenſe it hath been uſed in the *Hymns* and other *Offices* of the Church, as in that expreſſion, *O felix culpa quæ talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem!* where it cannot be denied that the word is uſed in an improper Senſe.

Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 31. *n.* 9.

2. When the *School Divines* ſet themſelves to explain the Myſteries of *Theology*, this plain and eaſie, but improper ſenſe of *Merit*, would not go down with ſom of them; but they endeavoured to make out the notion of *Merit* with reſpect to God, in its *proper and original Senſe.* The laſt conſiderable Writer before the *Scholaſtick Age*, was St. *Bernard*, and he pretended not to find out any ſuch proportion between the beſt Works and Eternal Life, *that God ſhould be bound in juſtice to beſtow it as a Recompence for them*; and the Reaſon he gives is plain and ſtrong, *becauſe thoſe things men pretend to merit by, are themſelves the Gifts of God's Grace, and ſo by them they are more bound to God, than God to them*; but beſides, *what are all mens merits to Eternal Glory?* St. *Bernard* doth not ſpeak of *Merits without Grace*, but with the *ſuppoſition* of it; and *Bellarmin* wiſely left out the latter part, that he might ſeem to anſwer the former.

Neque enim talia ſunt hominum merita, ut propter ea vita æterna deberetur ex jure, aut Deus injuriam aliquam faceret, niſi eam donaret. Nam ut taceam quod merita omnia Dona Dei ſunt, & ita homo magis propter ipſa Deo debitor eſt, quam Deus homini, quid ſunt merita omnia ad tantam gloriam? Bernard *Serm.* 1. *de Annun.* Bellarm. *de Juſtif. l.* 5. *c.* 6.

Hugo de Sancto Victore lived in the ſame Age, who firſt ſhewed the way to *School Divinity*, and upon the ſame place which St. *Bernard* ſpeaks of, *Non ſunt condig-*

Hugo de S. Vict. *cannot. Elucidator in* Rom.

na,

na, &c. he puts the Queſtion, *how any temporal Acts can merit that which is eternal?* And he denies *any Condignity*, becauſe *there is more in the Reward than there was in the Merit*; but then he adds, *that there may be a threefold compariſon of things; either as to themſelves, as a Horſe for a Horſe, Money for Money; or according to equity, either in puniſhments or rewards; or by Pact or Agreement, as when a good ſumm is promiſed for a little work; and this*, ſaith he, *God hath made known to Mankind as to future rewards and puniſhments.* Which plainly ſhews, he underſtood nothing of the proportion between Acts of *Grace*, and an *Eternal Happineſs*; but reſolved all into the *Favour* and *Mercy of God.*

Lomb. *Sent. l. 2. diſt. 27.* *Peter Lombard*, called *the Maſter of the Sentences*, ſaith, *Nothing of any Condignity or Proportion in our works to the Reward; but*, he ſaith, *they are themſelves God's Gifts, and that the Reward it ſelf is from the Grace of God*, and quotes the noted Saying of St. *Auguſtin*, *Cum coronat Deus merita noſtra, nihil aliud coronat quam dona ſua.* But ſtill this is nothing but Grace and Favour in God, firſt in enabling us to do good Works, and then in rewarding them.

Bandinus wrote a Book of the *Sentences* much about the time *P. Lombard* did, with ſo much agreement of Method and Expreſſions, that it is not known which took from the other. Genebrard. *de Trinit. l. 3. p. 312.* *Genebrard* hath produced this paſſage out of him, *Debet, inciviliter de Deo dicitur, quia nihil omnino nobis debet, niſi ex promiſſo.* If it be ſo rude to ſay *God owes any thing to his Creatures but by promiſe*, he could not imagine any *Condignity* in good Works, to which a Reward is due in Juſtice. And *Genebrard* thinks he had reaſon to deny, *that God can be made a Debtor to us by any of our Works.*

Robertus

Robertus Pullus, who wrote another Book of the *Sentences* about the ſame time, mentioning that place, *Non ſunt condignæ, &c.* he ſaith, *becauſe our Works are not ſufficient, being ſmall and temporal, God by his Mercy makes it up*; which not onely ſhews that God doth reward beyond our merit, but that there is no proportion between the beſt Works and Eternal Glory. Pull. *Sentent. Part.* 1. *c.* 13.

But by the time of *Gulielmus Antiſſiodorenſis*, there were two Parties in the Church about this point; *ſome*, he ſaith, *denied any Merit of Eternal Life, ex condigno*, and others aſſerted it; and after laying down the Arguments on both ſides, he concludes for the Affirmative; but in Anſwer to the place, *Non ſunt condignæ, &c.* he ſaith they are not *ad proportionaliter merendum*, but they are *ad ſimpliciter merendum*; ſo that ſtill he denied any *Proportion*, though he held *ſimple Merit*. Guliel. Antiſ. *l.* 3. *tr.* 12. *q.* 2. *de merito virt.*

But *Thomas Aquinas* coming after him, denies *that there can be any ſimple Merit with reſpect to God, becauſe that cannot be where there is ſo great inequality*; *and ſo there can be no equal Juſtice between them, but according to a proportion*; which he afterwards explains, viz. *as to the ſubſtance and Freedom of our good Works there is onely a Congruity*; *but as they proceed from Divine Grace, ſo they are meritorious of Eternal Life, ex condigno.* 1. 2. *q.* 114. *art.* 1. *art.* 2.

This Doctrine had ſome followers in the Schools, but not many in compariſon of thoſe who oppoſed it, as appears by what is ſaid already.

Richardus de Mediavilla, though a *Franciſcan*, follows herein the Doctrine of *Aquinas*, and aſſerts, *that by Acts of Free Will, informed by Grace, a man may merit Eternal Life, ex condigno*, and he adds ſomewhat more, *poteſt certiſſime*; and he uſes the ſame Anſwers to the Objections which the other did. Richard. *in Sent. l.* 2. *diſt.* 27. *art.* 2. *q.* 3.

And

Nich. de Orb. *in Sent. l. 2. dist. 27.* And *Nich. de Orbellis* follows *Richardus*, so that *Aquinas* his Doctrine had prevailed beyond his own School.

But it was as vehemently opposed by others of that Fraternity, among whom Cardinal *Hosius* mentions *Stephanus Brulifer*, who maintained, *that no Act of Grace, how good soever, was worthy of Eternal Life.*

Hos. *Confess. Petrico c. 73. p. 141.*

P. Burg. *addit. ad* Lyram *in Pf. 35.* *Paulus Burgensis*, though he is said to have been converted from being a Jew, by reading *Aquinas*, yet utterly dissented from him in this matter: For he saith, *that no man can by the Ordinary assistance of Grace Merit Eternal Life* ex condigno, *and therefore the Mercy of God is most seen in Heaven.*

However the Reputation of *Aquinas* might gain upon some, yet this was very far then from being a *Catholick Tradition.*

But no Council ever interposed its Authority in this matter, till the Council of *Trent*, which resolved to carry the Points in difference to the height, and to establish every thing that was questioned. Nothing had been more easie than to have given satisfaction in this matter, considering what *Pighius* and *Contarenus*, and even *Genebrard*, had yielded in it; but there the Rule was, that every thing that was disputed, must be determined first, and then defended.

And so it hath happened with this *Decree*, which, lest we should think the matter capable of softening, hath been since asserted in the highest manner. *Bellarmin* asserts *Good Works of themselves, and not merely by compact, to be meritorious of Eternal Life, so that in them there is a certain Proportion and Equality to Eternal Life.*

Bell. *de justif. l. 5. c. 17.*

Coster. *Enchirid. p. 294.* *Costerus* saith, *that in Works of Grace, there is an equality between the Work and the Reward.*

Suarez

Suarez, that they have an intrinsecal Dignity, whereby they become worthy of Eternal Life. Suarez. *de Grat. l.* 12. *c.* 1. *n.* 18.

Vasquez, that there is an Equality of Dignity between Good Works and Eternal Life, without which a Promise could not make true Merit. Vasquez *in* 1. 2. *Disp.* 213. *c.* 5.

The Rhemists say, *that good Works are truly and properly meritorious, and justly worthy of Everlasting Life; and that thereupon Heaven is the just Due, and just Stipend, Crown or Recompence, which God by his Justice oweth to the Persons so doing by his Grace.* Rhemists *on* 2 Tim. 4. 8.

And again, *that Good Works are meritorious, and the very cause of Salvation. so far that God should be unjust, if he rendred not Heaven for the same.* *On* Heb. 6. 8.

Phil. Gamachæus, a late Professour of Divinity in the *Sorbon*, speaks it roundly, *that the Council of* Trent *did plainly mean to establish Merit* ex condigno, *and that all Catholicks are agreed in it.* Gamach. *in* 1. 2. *Th.* Q. 114. *c.* 2. *Concil.* 2. *Omnes Catholici fatentur justos suis bonis operibus mereri gloriam de Condigno.*

The last Defender of the Council of *Trent* within these few years, saith, *That there is an intrinsecal Condignity in good Works, whereby they bear a proportion commensurate with the Glory of Heaven. And without such Doctrine as this, he doth not think the Council of* Trent *can be defended in this matter.* Aug. Reding *Defens. Conc.* Trident. *Tr.* 4. *sect.* 2. *ad sess.* 6. *c.* 1.

If after all it be said, that *this is a mere subtilty concerning the proportion an Act of Grace bears to the state of Glory*; I answer, the more to blame they, who have made and imposed it as a matter of Faith, as the Council of *Trent* hath done with an *Anathema*, and that without any pretence from *Catholick Tradition.*

But what made the Council of Trent *so much concerned for a Scholastick Subtilty?* There was a deep Mystery lay in this, They were wise enough to frame the Decree so, as to avoid Offence, and to make it appear plausible,

but it was enough to the People to understand that the *Merit of Good Works* was allowed, and they were to believe the Priests, both as to *the Good Works* they were to do, and as to the putting them into a *state of Grace*, to make them capable of *meriting*. And this was the true Reason of the *Anathema*, against those who should deny the *true Merit of Good Works*.

V. Of the Number of Sacraments.

The *Council* of *Trent* pronounces an *Anathema* in these words, *If any one saith that the Sacraments of the new Law were not all appointed by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they were more or fewer than Seven*, viz. *Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Matrimony, or that any one of these is not truly and properly a Sacrament, let him be* Anathema.

Sess. 7. Can. 1.

But what is it to be *truly and properly a Sacrament?*

It had been very reasonable to have defined a *Sacrament* first *truly and properly*, before such an *Anathema* passed. But that defect may be said to be supplied by the *Roman Catechism*, published by Authority of the Council; and there we are told, that *a Sacrament is a sensible thing, which by divine Institution hath a power of causing as well as signifying holiness and righteousness.* So that to a *true and proper Sacrament* two things are necessary:

Catech. Trident. Part. 2. n. 10.

1. That it be of *Divine Institution.*
2. That it *confer Grace on those who partake of it.*

And by these we must examin *the Catholick Tradition* about the number of *Sacraments.*

Bellarmin saith, *that all their Divines, and the whole Church for 500 years*, viz. *from the time of the Master of the Sentences, have agreed in the Number of the seven Sacraments.*

Bell. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 25.

Here

Here we ſee is a bold Appeal to *Tradition* for 500 years; but although, if it were proved, it cannot be ſufficient to prove an *Apoſtolical Tradition*; for the Fathers might for a *thouſand years* have held the contrary; and I do not think one clear Teſtimony can be produced out of Antiquity for that number of Sacraments, *truly* ſo called; yet I ſhall at preſent wholly wave the debate of the former times, and confine my ſelf to *Bellarmin*'s 500 *years*; and I hope to make it appear there was no *Univerſal Tradition* for it within his own time.

For *Alexander Hales (who wrote*, ſaith *Poſſevin, his Summ of Divinity by order of* Innocent IV. *and it was approved by* Alexander IV. *with ſeventy Divines,)* affirms, *there were but Four proper Sacraments*; now if this were the Catholick *Tradition then, That there were Seven proper Sacraments*, how could this Doctrine paſs, and be ſo highly approved? He ſaith farther, *that Chriſt himſelf only appointed two*, viz. *Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper*; *and for the reſt*, he ſaith, *it may be preſumed the Apoſtles did appoint them by Chriſt's Direction, or by divine Inſpiration.* But how can that be, when he ſaith, *the Form even of thoſe he calls proper Sacraments, was either appointed by our Lord or by the Church?* How can ſuch Sacraments be of *divine Inſtitution*, whoſe very *Form* is appointed by the Church? He puts the Queſtion himſelf, *why Chriſt appointed the Form only of Two Sacraments, when all the Grace of the Sacraments comes from him?* He anſwers, *becauſe theſe are the principal Sacraments which unite the whole man in the body of the Church by Faith and Charity.* But yet this doth not clear the Difficulty, how thoſe can be *proper Sacraments, whoſe Form is not of Divine Inſtitution*; as he

In quatuor quæ ſunt propriè dicta Sacramenta novæ legis eſt forma inſtituta a Domino vel ab Eccleſia. Alex. Halenſ. *Part.* 4. *q.* 5. *M.* 3. *a.* 2.

Memb. 2. *a.* 1.

Memb. 3. *a.* 2. *ſect.* 3.

grants in the Sacrament of *Penance* and *Orders*, the *Form* is of the *Churches Appointment*.

And this will not only reach to this great *School Divine*, but to as many others as hold it in the *Churches Power* to appoint or alter the *Matter* and *Form* of some of those they call *Sacraments*. For, however they may use the Name, they can never agree with the Council of *Trent* in the Nature of the *Seven Sacraments*, which supposes them to be of *Divine Institution*, as to *Matter* and *Form*. And so the Divines of the *Church* of *Rome* have agreed since the Council of *Trent*.

Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 1. *c.* 21. *Bellarmin* hath a Chapter on purpose to shew, *that the Matter and Form of Sacraments are so certain and determinate, that nothing can be changed in them; and this determination must be by God himself. Which*, he saith, *is most certain among them*; and he proves it by a *substantial Reason*, viz. *because the Sacraments are the Causes of Grace; and no one can give Grace but God, and therefore none else can appoint the Essentials of Sacraments but he*, and therefore he calls it *Sacrilege to change even the matter of Sacraments*.

Suarez. *in* 3. *p. Th. Tom.* 3. *Disp.* 2. *sect.* 3. *Suarez* asserts, *that both the Matter and Form of Sacraments are determined by Christ's Institution, and as they are determined by him, they are necessary to the making of Sacraments. And this* (he saith) *absolutely speaking, is* de Fide, *or an Article of Faith*. And he proves it from the manner of Christ's instituting Baptism and the Eucharist, and he urges the same Reason, *because Christ only can confer Grace by the Sacraments, and therefore he must appoint the Matter and Form of them.*

Lugo *de Sacram. Disp.* 2. *sect.* 5. Cardinal *Lugo* affirms, *that Christ hath appointed both Matter and Form of the Sacraments*, which he proves from the Council of *Trent*. He thinks *Christ might have granted a Commission to his Church to appoint Sacraments, which*

which he would make efficacious, but he neither believes that he hath done it, or that it was fitting to be done.

Petrus à Sancto Joseph saith, *that although the Council of* Trent *doth not expresly affirm the Sacraments to be immediately instituted by Christ; yet it is to be so understood. And although the Church may appoint* Sacramentalia, *i.e.* Rites about the Sacraments; *yet Christ himself must appoint the Sacraments themselves*; and he concludes, *that no Creature can have authority to make Sacraments conferring Grace*; and therefore he declares *that Christ did appoint the Forms of all the Sacraments himself, although we do not read them in Scripture.* Pet. à Sanct. Joseph. *Idea Theol. Sacr. l. 1. c. 3.*

If now it appears that some even of the Church of *Rome* before the Council of *Trent*, did think it in the *Churches Power* to appoint or alter the *Matter* and *Form* of some of those they called *Sacraments*, then it will evidently follow they had not the same Tradition about the Seven Sacraments which is there deliver'd.

Of Chrism.

The Council of *Trent* declares the matter of *Confirmation* to be *Chrism*, viz. *a Composition made of Oyl of Olive and Balsam*; *the one to signifie the clearness of Conscience, the other the Odour of a good Fame*, saith the *Council* of *Florence*. But where was this *Chrism* appointed by Christ? *Marsilius* saith from *Petrus Aureolus, that there was a Controversie between the Divines and Canonists about this matter*; *and the latter affirmed that Chrism was not appointed by Christ, but afterwards by the Church*; *and that the Pope could dispense with it*; *which he could not do if it were of Christ's Institution.* *Conc.* Trid. *De Confirm. Can.* 2. *Conc.* Florent. *Decret. Unionis.* Marsil. *in Sent. l.* 4 *q.* 5. *a.* 1.

Petrus Aureolus was himself a great Man in the Church of *Rome*; and after he had mentioned this difference, and named Aureol *in* 4. *d.* 7. *q.* 1.

named one *Brocardus* (or *Bernardus*) with other *Canonists* for it; he doth not affirm the contrary to be a *Catholick Tradition*; but himself asserts the *Chrism* not to be necessary to the *Sacrament* of *Confirmation*; which he must have done if he had believed it of Divine Institution.

Greg de Val. *Tom.* 4. *Q.* 5. *Punct.* 2.

Gregory de Valentia on the occasion of this Opinion of the *Canonists*, *that Confirmation might be without Chrism*, saith two notable things. 1. *That they were guilty of Heresie therein*: for which he quotes *Dominicus Soto*. 2. *That he thinks there were no Canonists left of that mind.* If not, the Change was greater; since it is certain they were of that Opinion before. For *Guido Brianson* attests, *that there was a difference between the Divines and Canonists about this matter*; for *Bernard* the *Glosser* and others held, that *Chrism was not necessary to it, because it was neither appointed by Christ nor his Apostles, but in some ancient Councils.*

Guido Brianson *in* 4. *sent. q.* 5. *Conc.* 1.

Guil. Antis. *in l.* 4. *tract.* 9.

Guil. Antissiodorensis long before mentions the Opinion of those who said *that Chrism was appointed by the Church after the Apostles times*; *and that they confirmed only by imposition of hands*; but he doth not condemn it; only *he thinks it better to hold that the Apostles used Chrism, although we never read that they did it.* But he doth not lay that Opinion only on the *Canonists*; for there were *Divines* of great note of the same. For,

Bonav. *in* 4. *d.* 7. *a.* 1. *q.* 2.

Bonaventure saith, *that the Apostles made use neither of their Matter nor Form in their Confirmation*; *and his Resolution is, that they were appointed by the Governors of the Church afterwards*; as his Master *Alexander* of *Hale* had said before him, who attributes the *Institution* of both to a Council of *Meaux*.

Alex. *p.* 4. *q.* 9. *membr.* 1.

Jac. de Vitr. *Hist. Occid. c.* 37.

Cardinal *de Vitriaco* saith, *that Confirmation by Imposition of Hands was from the Apostles*; *but by Chrism from the*

the Church; for we do not read that the Apoſtles uſed it. *Thomas Aquinas* confeſſes *there were different Opinions about the Inſtitution of this Sacrament; ſome held that it was not inſtituted by Chriſt nor his Apoſtles, but afterwards in a certain Council.* But he never blames theſe for contradicting *Catholick Tradition* although he diſlikes their Opinion. Aq. p. 3. q. 72. a 1. Reſp. ad 1.

Cajetan on *Aquinas* ſaith, *that Chriſm with Balſam was appointed by the Church after the Primitive times*; and yet now, this muſt be believed to be eſſential to this Sacrament; and by *Conink* it ſeems *to be heretical to deny it.* For he affirms, *that it ſeems to be an Article of Faith that Confirmation muſt be with Chriſm, and no Catholick*, he ſaith, *now denies it.* Which ſhews, that he believed the ſenſe of the Church not to have been always the ſame about it. Conink de Sacram. q. 72. a. 3. dub. 1.

But others ſpeak out, as *Gregory de Valentia*, *Suarez*, *Filliucius* and *Tanner*, who ſay abſolutely, *it is now a matter of Faith to hold Chriſm to be eſſential to Confirmation*; *and that it is now not onely erroneous but heretical to deny it.* Their Teſtimonies are at large produced by *Petrus Aurelius*, or the famous *Abbat* of S. *Cyran.* And even he grants it to be *Hereſie ſince the Council of* Trent; but he yields that *Alenſis*. *Bonaventure* and *de Vitricco* all held that Opinion, which was made Hereſie by it. From whence it follows, that there hath been a change in the Doctrine of the Roman Church about Confirmation by Chriſm. For if it be Hereſie now to aſſert that which was denied without any reproach before, the Tradition cannot be ſaid to continue the ſame. Petr. Aurel. *Oper. p.* 546, 547. *p.* 567.

Thus we have ſeen there was no certain Tradition for the *Matter* of this Sacrament, and as little is there for the *Form* of it. Which is, *Conſigno te ſigno Crucis, & confirmo te Chriſmate ſalutis in nomine Patris, &c.* But *Sirmondus*

Sirmon. Ant. 2. p. 64. *Sirmondus* produces another Form out of S. *Ambrose*, *Deus Pater omnipotens, qui te regeneravit ex Aqua & Spiritu Sancto, concessitque tibi peccata tua, ipse te ungat in vitam æternam.* And from thence concludes the present *Form* not to be ancient; and he confesses that both *Matter* and *Form* of this Sacrament are changed. Which was an ingenuous Confession; but his adversary takes this Advantage from it; *that then the Sacrament it self must be changed, if both Matter and Form were; and then the Church must be a very unfaithful keeper of Tradition*; which I think is unanswerable. *Suarez* proposes the Objection fairly *both as to the Matter and Form of this Sacrament, that we read nothing of them in Scripture, and Tradition is very various about them*; but his Answer is very insufficient, *viz. that though it be not in Scripture, yet they have them by Tradition from the Apostles*; now that is the very thing which *Sirmondus* disproves, and shews that the Church of *Rome* is clearly gone off from *Tradition* here both as to *Matter* and *Form*.

p. 63.

Petr. Aurel. Op. p. 567.

Suarez. To. 3. q. 3. p. Th. Q. 72. Disp. 33. sect. 5.

Of Orders.

I proceed to the *Sacrament* of *Orders*. It is impossible for those of the Church of *Rome* to prove this *a true and proper Sacrament*, on their own Grounds. For, they assert that such a one must have *Matter and Form appointed by Christ*; but that which they account the *Matter* and *Form* of *Orders* were neither of them of Christ's Institution. The Council of *Florence*, they say, *hath declared both*; *the matter is that, by the delivery whereof the Order is confer'd, as that of Priesthood by the delivery of the Chalice with the Wine, and the Paten with the Bread*; *and the Form* is, *Accipe potestatem offerendi Sacrificium in Ecclesia pro vivis & mortuis.* Now if neither of these be

Decret. Unionis.

be owned by themſelves to have been appointed by Chriſt, then it neceſſarily follows, that they cannot hold this to be *a true and proper Sacrament.* Impoſition of hands they grant was uſed by the Apoſtles, and ſtill continued in the Chriſtian Church; and *Bellarmin* confeſſes *that nothing elſe can be proved by Scripture to be the external Symbol in this Sacrament.* And others are forced to ſay, *that Chriſt hath not determined the Matter and Form of this Sacrament particularly, but hath left a latitude in it for the Church to determin it.* Which in my opinion is clear giving up the Cauſe, as to this Sacrament.

Bell. *de Sacr. Ordinis, l.* 1. *c.* 9.

It is obſerved by *Arcudius, that the Council of* Trent *doth not declare the particular Matter and Form of this Sacrament, but only in general, that it is performed by words and external ſigns,* Seſſ. 23. c. 3. From whence he infers, *that the outward Sign was left to the Churches determination*; and he ſaith, *that Chriſt did particularly appoint the Matter and Form of ſome Sacraments, as of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, and Extreme Unction, but not of others; and therefore in the Sacrament of Orders,* he ſaith, *Chriſt determined no more but that it ſhould be conveyed by ſome viſible ſign; and ſo it may be either by the delivering the Veſſels, or by the impoſition of hands, or both.* But we are to conſider that the Council of *Florence* was received by the Council of *Trent*; and that it is impoſſible to reconcile this Doctrin with the general Definition of a Sacrament by the *Roman Catechiſm,* viz. *that it is a ſenſible thing which by the Inſtitution of Chriſt hath a power of cauſing as well as ſignifying* Grace; which implies that the external Sign which conveys Grace muſt be appointed by the Authour of the Sacrament it ſelf; or elſe the Church muſt have Power to annex Divine Grace to its own appointments.

Arcud. *de Sacram. l.* 6. *c.* 4.

But here lies the main difficulty, the Church of *Rome* hath altered both *Matter* and *Form* of this Sacrament from the primitive Institution; and yet it dares not disallow the Ordinations made without them, as is notorious in the Case of the *Greek Church*; and therefore they have been forced to allow this latitude as to the *Matter* and *Form* of this Sacrament; although such an allowance doth really overthrow its being a true and proper *Sacrament* on their own grounds.

Lugo *de Sac. Disp.* 2. *sect.* 5. *n.* 85.

Yet this Doctrine hath very much prevailed of late among their chief Writers. Cardinal *Lugo* confesses, *that of old Priesthood was conferred by imposition of Hands with suitable Words; and he saw it himself so done at* Rome, *without delivering the Vessels by Catholick Greek Bishops.* He saith farther, *that the Fathers and Councils are so plain for the conferring Priesthood by imposition of hands, that no one can deny it*; but yet he must justifie the *Roman Church* in assuming new *Matter* and *Form*, which he doth by asserting *that Christ left the Church at liberty as to them.*

n. 92.

Ysambert. *de Sacram. Ordinis, Disp.* 3. *Art.* 6.

Nicol. Ysambertus debates the point at large, and his Resolution of it is, *that Christ determined only the general matter, but the particular sign was left to the Church; and he proves by Induction that the Church hath appointed the external sign in this Sacrament, and as to the Order of Priesthood* he proves *that Imposition of hands was of old an essential part of it, but now it is only accidental.*

Hallier *de Sacris Electt. & Ordinat. sect.* 2. *c.* 2. *art.* 1.

Franciscus Hallier confesses *the Matter of this Sacrament to have been different in different times.* In the Apostles times and many Ages after, hardly any other can be found but imposition of hands, as he proves *from Scripture and Fathers.* He carries his proofs down as low as the *Synod* of *Aken* in the time of *Ludovicus Pius*, and the Council of *Meaux, A. D.* 845. but afterwards he

he ſaith, *that by the Council of* Florence *and the common Opinion of their Divines, the delivery of the Veſſels is the eſſential matter of this Sacrament.* Here we find a plain change in the *Matter* of a *Sacrament* owned after the continuance of above 800 years; and yet we muſt believe the *Tradition* of this Church to have been always the ſame. Which is impoſſible by the Confeſſion of their own Writer. He cannot tell juſt the time when the change was made, but he concludes it was before the time of the *Vetus Ordo Romanus*, which mentions the Veſſels. p. 439.

Petrus a Sancto Joſeph ſaith, *that by Chriſt's Inſtitution there is a latitude allowed in the matter of Orders*; but he ſhews not where; but he thinks, *of it ſelf it conſiſts in the delivery of the Veſſels, but by the Pope's permiſſion Impoſition of Hands may be ſufficient.* Which is a Doctrin which hath neither Scripture, Reaſon nor Tradition for it. Petr. à Sanct. Joſeph, *Idea Theol. Sacr. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *p.* 396.

Joh. Morinus ſhews that there are *five Opinions* in the Church of *Rome* about the matter of this Sacrament. *The firſt and moſt common is that it conſiſts in the delivery of the Veſſels. The ſecond, that Impoſition of Hands together with that makes up the matter. The third, that they convey two different powers. The fourth, that Unction with Impoſition of Hands is the matter. The fifth, that Impoſition of Hands alone is it; and this,* ſaith he, *the whole Church, Greek and Latin, ever owned*; but he ſaith, *he can bring two demonſtrations againſt the firſt, i. e.* againſt the general ſenſe of the now Roman Church. 1. *From the Practice of the Greek Church, which never uſed it.* 2. *From the old Rituals of the Latin Church, which do not mention them*; and he names ſome above 800 years old; and in none of them he finds *either the Matter or Form of this Sacrament*, as it is now practiſed in the Morin. *de Sacris Ordin. Part.* 3. *Exercit.* 7. *c.* 1.

Church of *Rome*; nor in *Isidore*, *Alcuinus*, *Amalarius*, *Rabanus Maurus*, *Valafridus Strabo*, although they wrote purposely about these things. He thinks *it was first received into the publick Offices in the tenth Age.* After-
c. 3. n. 1. wards he saith, *he wonders how it came about that any should place the essential Matter of Ordination only in delivery of the Vessels, and exclude the Imposition of Hands, which alone is mentioned by Scripture and Fathers.* And
n. 6. again he saith, *it strikes him with astonishment that there*
c. 6. *should be such an alteration, both as to Matter and Form.*
n. 2. And at last he saith, *Christ hath determined no particular Matter and Form in this Sacrament.*

But still the Difficulty returns, how this can be a *true and proper Sacrament*, whose *Matter* and *Form* depend on *divine Institution*, when they confess there was no divine Institution for the *Matter* and *Form* in *Orders?*

Bell. *de Sacram. l.* 1. *c.* 24. *Bellarmin* (as is proved before) hath a Chapter on purpose to prove *that the Matter and Form of Sacraments are so determined, that it is not lawful to add, diminish or alter them*; and he charges it on *Luther* as a part of his Heresie, *that no certain Form of words was required to Sacraments*: and he makes it no less than *Sacrilege to change the Matter of them.* So that all such who hold the *Matter* and *Form* in *Orders* to be mutable, must either charge the *Church* of *Rome* with *Sacrilege*, or deny *Orders* to be *a true and proper Sacrament.*

Of

Of the Sacrament of Penance.

The next new *Sacrament* is that of *Penance*. They are agreed, that *Matter* and *Form* are both neceſſary to a *true and proper Sacrament*. The *Matter* is the *external or ſenſible Sign*; and what is that in this *New Sacrament?*

There are two things neceſſary to the *Matter* of a Sacrament:

1. That it be an *External and ſenſible Sign*; which S. *Auguſtin* calls an *Element* in that known Expreſſion, *Accedat verbum ad Elementum, & fit Sacramentum*; which *Bellarmin* would have underſtood only of *Baptiſm* there ſpoken of; but S. *Auguſtin*'s meaning goes farther, as appears by his following Diſcourſe, and immediately he calls a Sacrament *verbum viſibile*; and therefore cannot be applied to Words as they are heard, for ſo they have nothing of a *Sacramental ſign* in them. How then can *Contrition* make up any part of the *Matter* of a *Sacrament*, when it is not *external*? How can *Confeſſion*, when it is no *viſible ſign*, nor any *permanent* thing as an *Element* muſt be? how can *ſatisfaction* be any part of the Sacrament, which may be done when the *Effect* of the *Sacrament* is over in *Abſolution?*

Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 80.

2. There muſt be a *Reſemblance* between the *Sign* and the *Thing ſignified*. Which St. *Auguſtin* is ſo peremptory in, *that he denies there can be any Sacrament where there is no Reſemblance. And from hence*, he ſaith, *the Signs take the name of the Thing ſignified; as after a certain manner the Sacrament of the Body of Chriſt is the Body of Chriſt.*

St. Aug. *Ep. ad* Bonifac.

And this was looked on as ſo neceſſary, that *Hugo de Sancto Victore* and *Peter Lombard* both put it into the Definition of a Sacrament, as *Suarez* confeſſes, viz. *that*

Suarez. *Tom.* 3. *in* 3. *C. Q.* 60. *Diſp.* 1. *a.* 3. *ſect.* 4.

it

it is the visible appearance of Invisible Grace, which bears the similitude, and is the Cause of it. But this is left out of the Definition in the *Roman Catechism*, and *Suarez* thinks it *not necessary*, for the same Reason; *because it is very hard to understand the similitude between words spoken in Confession, and the Grace supposed to be given by Absolution, any more than in the words of Abrenunciation, and the Grace of Baptism.* How can the Act of the *Penitent* signifie the Grace conveyed in *Absolution?* For there is no effect of the *Sacrament* till *Absolution*, by their own *Confession*; and therefore the Acts of the Penitent being antecedent to it, and of a different nature from it, can have no such Resemblance with it, as to signifie or represent it.

Concil. Flor. *Decr. Union. Concil.* Trid. *Sess.* 14. *c.* 3.

However the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent* have declared, that the *Acts* of the *Penitent*, viz. *Contrition*, *Confession* and *Satisfaction*, are *as the matter* in the Sacrament. *Quasi materia:* What is this *quasi materia?* Why not, *are the matter?* Is not *true matter* necessary to a *true Sacrament?* If there be none *true* here, then this can be but *quasi Sacramentum*, *as it were a Sacrament*, and not *truly and properly* so. But if it be *true matter*, why is it not so declared? But common Sense hindred them, and not the difference between the matter here and in other Sacraments. For in the Definition of *Sacraments* they were to regard the *Truth*, and not the *kind* of Matter. *They are not solid and permanent Matter*, saith *Bellarmin*; *not Matter externally applied*, saith *Soto*; *not any Substance but humane Acts*, saith *Vasquez*; but none of these clear the point. For still if it be *true Matter* of a *Sacrament*, why was it not so declared? Why such a term of Diminution added, as all men must understand it, who compare it with the expressions about the other Sacraments?

Bell. de pœnit. l. 1. *c.* 16. *Soto in l.* 4. *sent. d.* 14. *q.* 1. *Vasq. in* 3. *p. q.* 84 *Art.* 1. *c.* 9.

But

But they knew very well there was a considerable Party in the Church of *Rome*, who denied the *Acts of the Penitent* to be the *Matter* or *Parts* of this *Sacrament*. The *Council* of *Colen* (but little before the Council of *Trent*) *excludes the Acts of the Penitent from any share in this Sacrament*: which *Bellarmin* denies not, but blames *Gropperus*, the supposed Author of the *Enchiridion*. But *Gropperus* was thought fit to be a *Cardinal* as well as *Bellarmin*; and certainly knew the *Tradition* of the Church if there had been any such in this matter. The Council of *Florence*, it is plain, he thought not to be a sufficient declarer of it. No more did *Joh. Major*, who after it *denied this Sacrament to consist of Matter and form, or that the Acts of the Penitent were the parts of it.* So did *Gabriel Biel, who refutes the contrary Opinion*, and saith *Contrition can be no part, because it is no sensible sign; and satisfaction may be done after it.* So that he cuts off two parts in three of the *Matter* of this pretended Sacrament.

Enchirid. Colon. *f.* 180.

Bell. *de pœnit. l.* 1. *c.* 16.

Major. *in* 4. *sent. dist.* 14. *q.* 2.

Biel *in* 4. *dist.* 14. *q.* 2.

Guido Brianson, who lived after the Council of *Florence* supposes no certain Tradition in the Church about this matter; but he sets down both Opinions with their Reasons, and prefers *that which excludes the Acts of the Penitent from being parts of the Sacrament*; although the *Florentine Council* had declared the contrary.

Brianson *in* 4. *sent. Q.* 8. *Concl.* 3.

Durandus rejects two parts in three of those declared by the two Councils, and for the same Reasons mentioned by *Biel*.

Durand. *in l.* 4. *dist.* 16. *q.* 1.

Ockam absolutely denies *all three to be Parts of the Sacrament*. And so did *Scotus* before him; whose words are remarkable, *De Pœnitentiæ Sacramento dico, quod illa tria nullo modo sunt partes ejus*, viz. *These three are by no means any part of the Sacrament of Penance*; and yet the Council of *Trent* not only declares that they are so, but denounces

Ockam *in* 4. *sent. q.* 8. Scot. *in l.* 4. *sent. dist.* 16. *Q.* 1.

Concil. Trid. *Seſſ.* 14. *de Pœnit. Sacr. Can.* 4. denounces an *Anathema* againſt him that denies them to be required, as the *Matter* of the *Sacrament of Penance.* And let any one by this judge what *Catholick Tradition* it proceeded upon; when ſome of the greateſt Divines in the Church of *Rome* were of another Opinion.

As to the *Form* of this *Sacrament* the Council of *Trent* denounces an *Anathema againſt thoſe who affirm Abſolution to be only declarative of the Remiſſion of Sins:* and yet I ſhall prove that this was the more current Doctrin, even in the Church of *Rome,* up to the Maſter of the *Sentences.*

Can. 9.

Biel *in* 4. *diſt.* 14. *q.* 2. *not.* 2. *Gabriel Biel* ſaith, *the ancient Doctors did commonly follow it*; but it was ſuppoſed by *Scotus*, becauſe *it ſeemed to take off from the efficacy of Abſolution, and conſequently make it no Sacrament, which is a cauſe of Grace.* But after he hath ſet down *Scotus* his Arguments, he ſaith, *that Opinion were very deſirable, if it had any Foundation in Scripture or Fathers.* And to his Arguments he anſwers, *that true Contrition obtains Pardon with God, before Sacerdotal Abſolution, but not with the Church*; *and that Contrition ſuppoſes a deſire of Abſolution*; which will never hold to make Abſolution to confer the Grace of Remiſſion, if the Sin be really forgiven before. For what is the deſire of the Penitent to the force of the Sacrament adminiſtred by the Prieſt? And he ſaith, they all grant, *that by true and ſufficient Contrition the ſin is forgiven without the Sacrament in act, i. e.* the actual receiving abſolution. So that here was an univerſal Tradition as to the Power of *Contrition*, but in the other they had different Opinions.

Marſil. *in.* 4. *quæſt.* 4. 12. *Art.* 2. *Marſilius* ſaith, *that God forgives ſin upon Contrition Authoritatively*; *the Prieſts Abſolution is miniſterial in the Court of Conſcience, and before the Church. And thoſe ſins which God firſt abſolves from principally and Authentically,*

cally, the Prieſt afterwards abſolves from in right of the Church, as its Miniſter.

Toſtatus ſaith, *that the Prieſts Abſolution follows God's.* Toſtat. *Defenſ. part.* 1. *c.* 6.

Ockam, that the Prieſts then bind and looſe, when they ſhew men to be bound or looſed.; *and for this he relies on the Maſter of the Sentences.* Ockam *in l.* 4. *q.* 9. *a.* 4. *ad* 1.

Thomas de Argentina, that the Power of the Keys doth extend to the Remiſſion of the fault which was done before by Contrition; but it tends tô the Increaſe of Grace in the Perſon. Thom. *de* Argent. *l.* 4. *Diſt.* 18. *a* 3.

Gulielmus Antiſſiodore, that Contrition takes away the guilt and puniſhment of Sin, as to God and Conſcience, but not as to the Church, for a man is ſtill bound to undergo the Penance which the Church enjoyns him. Gul. Antiſ. *l.* 4. *f.* 254.

Bonaventure, that Abſolution preſuppoſes Grace; for no Prieſt would abſolve any one whom he did not preſume God had abſolved before. Bonavent. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 18. *q.* 1.

Alexander Hales, that where God doth not begin in Abſolution, the Prieſt cannot make it up. Alex. Halenſ. *part* 4. *q.* 21. *memb.* 3. *art.* 1.

But the *Maſter* of the *Sentences* himſelf moſt fully handles this point; and ſhews from the *Fathers, that God alone can remit ſin both as to the Fault and the Puniſhment due to it. And the Power of the Keys*, he ſaith, *is like the Prieſts Judgment about Leproſie in the Levitical Law, God healed the Perſon, and the Prieſt declared him healed. Or as our Saviour firſt raiſed* Lazarus, *then gave him to his Diſciples to be looſed. He is looſed before God, but not in the face of the Church but by the Prieſts Judgment. Another way*, he ſaith, *Prieſts bind by enjoyning Penance, and they looſe by remitting it, or readmitting Perſons to Communion upon performing it.* Pet. Lomb. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 18. *part.* 1.

This Doctrin of *Peter Lombard*'s is none of thoſe *in quibus Magiſter non tenetur*; for we ſee he had followers of great Name, almoſt to the Council of *Trent*. But it

happened, that both *Th. Aquinas* and *Scotus* agreed in oppoſing this Doctrin; and the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans* bearing greateſt ſway in the Debates of the Council of *Trent*, what they agreed in, paſſed for *Catholick Tradition*. And *Vaſquez* is in the right when he ſaith, *this Doctrin was condemned by the Council of* Trent; and ſo was *Scotus*, when he ſaid, *that it did derogate from the Sacrament of Penance*; for in truth it makes it but a *nominal Sacrament*, ſince it hath no Power of conferring Grace; which the Council of *Trent* makes neceſſary to a *true and proper Sacrament*.

Vaſquez *in* 3. Q. 84. A. 3. *dub.* 2. 17.

The main Point in this Debate is, whether *true contrition* be required to *Abſolution* or not? Which *Scotus* ſaw well enough and argues accordingly. For none of them deny, that where there is true Contrition, there is immediately an *Abſolution* before God; and if this be required before the *Prieſts Abſolution*, he can have no more to do, but to pronounce or declare him abſolved. But if ſomething leſs than *Contrition* do qualifie a Man for *Abſolution*, and by that Grace be conveyed, then the Power of Abſolution hath a great and real Effect; for it puts a Man into a *State of Grace* which he had not been in without it. And from hence came the Opinion, that *Attrition* with *Abſolution* was ſufficient; and they do not underſtand the Council of *Trent*'s Doctrin of the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, who deny it, as will appear to any one that reads the 4th Chapter of the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, and compares it with the 7, and 8 Canons about *Sacraments in general*. It is true that Contrition is there ſaid to have the firſt place in the *Acts* of the Penitent; but obſerve what follows: *True Contrition reconciles a Man to God, before he receives this Sacrament*. What hath the Prieſt then to do, but to declare him reconciled? *But it ſaith not without the deſire of it*. Suppoſe not, yet the

the thing is done upon the desire,& therefore the Priests Power can be no more than declarative. And that such a Desire is so necessary as without Contrition avails not,is more than the Council hath proved,and it is barely supposed, to maintain the Necessity of going to the Priest for *Absolution*; and so it will be no more than a Precept of the *Church*, and not a condition of Remission in the Sacrament of *Penance*. But afterwards,it declares *that imperfect Contrition or Attrition doth dispose a Man for the Grace of God in this Sacrament*; and by the general Canons, *the Sacraments do confer Grace where Men are disposed.* So that the Council of *Trent* did rightly comprehend the force of the *Power* of *Absolution*, which it gave to the *Priest* in the Sacrament of *Penance*.

But what *Catholick Tradition* could there be for the Doctrin of the *Council* of *Trent* in thismatter, when *Hadrian 6.* so little before it declares, *it was a great difficulty among the Doctors, whether the Keys of Priesthood did extend to the Remission of the Fault*? And for the *Negative* he produces *Pet. Lombard*, *Alex. Alens.* and *Bonaventure*; and saith, *that Opinion is probable, because the Priests Power of binding and loosing is equal*; *and as they cannot bind where God doth not, for they cannot retain the sins of a true Penitent*; *so neither can they loose where God doth not*, *i. e.* where there is not *true Contrition*. But because he saith *others held the contrary Opinion, and had probability on their side too, therefore he would determine nothing*. Notwithstanding this, in a few years after, the Council of *Trent* finds no difficulty, no Probability in the other Opinion; but determines as boldly, as if there had been an *Universal Tradition* their way; whereas the contrary cannot be denied by any that are conversant in the Doctrin of their *Schools*. But it was the mighty Privilege of the Council of *Trent*, to make the Doctrins of

Hadrian *Quodlib. q. 5. 3. princip.*

Thomas and *Scotus*, when they agreed, to be *Articles of Faith*; and to denounce *Anathema's* againſt Oppoſers, although they reached to ſome of the greateſt Divines of their own Church, within *Bellarmin*'s compaſs of 500 *Years*.

Of Extreme Unction.

We are now to examin another pretended Sacrament, *viz.* of *Extreme Unction*. The Council of *Trent* declares this to be a *true and proper Sacrament, and denounces an Anathema againſt him that denies it to be inſtituted by Chriſt, and publiſhed by St.* James; *or that it confers Grace and Remiſſion of Sins; or that affirms it was appointed for bodily Cures. It farther declares from the place of St.* James *interpreted by Tradition, that the Matter is Oil conſecrated by the Biſhop; The Form, that which is now uſed,* Per iſtam unctionem, &c. *the Effect, the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt in purging away the remainder of Sin, and ſtrengthening the Soul; and ſometimes bodily cures, when it is expedient for the Health of the Soul.* So that the primary Intention of this Sacrament muſt reſpect the Soul, otherwiſe it is granted, it could not be a *true and proper Sacrament*. So *Suarez* ſaith in this Caſe, *If the external Sign be not immediately appointed for a ſpiritual Effect, it cannot prove a true Sacrament of the New Law; no not although the bodily cure were deſigned for the ſtrengthning of Faith.* And from hence he proves, *that when the Apoſtles are ſaid to anoint the ſick, and heal them,* Mark 6. 13. *this cannot relate to the Sacrament of Unction, becauſe their cures had not of themſelves an immediate reſpect to the Soul.* The ſame Reaſon is uſed by *Bellarmin*, *Sacramenta per ſe ad animam pertinent, ad corpus per accidens aut certe ſecundario.* The ſame is affirmed by *Maldonat*, although

Concil. Trid. *Seſſ.* 14. *Can.* 1, 2.

Cap. 1, 2, 3.

Suarez *in* 3. *part. diſp.* 39. *ſect.* 1. *n.* 5.

Bell. *de Extr. Unct. c.* 2. Mald. *de Sacram. Extr. Unct. q.* 2.

though he differs from *Bellarmin* about the Apostles *anointing with Oil*, which *Bellarmin* denies to have been *Sacramental* for this Reason, but *Maldonat* affirms it; and answers other Arguments of *Bellarmin*, but not this.

Gregory de Valentia carries it farther, and saith, *that if the anointing with Oil were only a Symbol of a miraculous Cure, it could be no Sacrament; for that is a Medium to convey supernatural Grace, and then it would last no longer than the Gift of Miracles.* Greg. de Val. *To.* 4. *Disp.* 8. *Q.* 1. *Punct.* 1.

So that we have no more to do, but only to prove that by the *Tradition* of the Church St. *James* his *anointing* was to be understood with respect to *bodily cures* in the first place.

We cannot pass over so great a Man as *Cajetan*, who wrote on that place of St. *James*, not long before the Council of *Trent*, and a good while after the Council of *Florence*, which relies on this place for this *Sacrament* of *Unction*. But *Cajetan* saith, *it doth not relate to it, because the immediate effect is the cure of the Party in Saint* James; *but in this Sacrament the direct and proper effect is Remission of Sins.* All that *Catharinus* hath to say against this, is, *that the bodily cure is not repugnant to it*; but what is this to the purpose, when the Question is, what is primarily designed in this place? Cath. *Annot. in Comment.* Cajet. *l.* 5. *p.* 464.

The *School Divines*, from *Peter Lombard*, had generally received this for a *Sacrament*; but the *Canonists* denied it, as appears by the *Glos* on *c. Vir autem de Secund. Nuptiis Decret. Gregor. Tit.* 21. where it is said, *that this Unction might be repeated, being no Sacrament but only Prayer over a Person.* The *Roman Correctors* cry out *it is Heresie by the Council of* Trent; but the *Glosser* knew no such thing; and if it were so only by the Council of *Trent*, then not by any *Catholick Tradi-*

tion

tion before. For, I ſuppoſe matter of *Hereſie* muſt reach to the *Canoniſts*, as well as the *Divines*.

But the plaineſt determination of this matter will be by the ancient *Offices* of the Church; for if they reſpected *bodily Cures* in the firſt place, then it is owned there could be no *Tradition* for any *Sacrament* in this *Unction*.

In the ancient *Ordo Romanus* it is called *Benedictio Olei ad omnem Languorem quocunque tempore*. I deſire to know whether the *Oil* ſo conſecrated be chiefly deſigned for the *Body* or the *Soul*. And in the *Office* it ſelf, this place of St. *James* is mentioned: And then follows, *Te Domine peritiſſimum Medicum imploramus, ut virtutis tuæ Medicinam in hoc Oleum propitius infundas*. And a little after, *Proſit Pater Miſericordiarum, febribus & dyſenteria laborantibus, proſit paralyticis, cæcis & claudis ſimulque vexatitiis*, with abundance more; which manifeſtly ſhews that this conſecrated *Oil* was intended primarily for the *cure of Diſeaſes*.

In the *Ambroſian Form*, the Prayer is, *Infunde ſanctificationem tuam huic Oleo, ut ab his quæ unxerit membra, fugatis inſidiis adverſariæ poteſtatis, ſuſceptione præſentis Olei, Sancti Spiritus Gratia ſalutaris debilitatem expellat & plenam conferat ſoſpitatem*, Where the effect relates to the ſoundneſs of the Members anointed, and not to the Sins committed by them.

Sacr. Greg. p. 252. In the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, publiſhed by *Menardus*, there is a *Prayer* wherein this place of St. *James* is mentioned; and preſently it follows, *Cura quæſumus Redemptor noſter gratia Spiritus Sancti languores iſtius infirmi, &c.* and immediately before the anointing, *Sana Domine infirmum iſtum, cujus oſſa turbata ſunt, &c.* and while he was anointing, the Patient was to ſay, *Sana me Domine*; and where the pain was greateſt, he was to be ſo much more anointed, *ubi plus dolor imminet amplius perungatur*.

While

While the reſt were anointing, one of the Prieſts was to pray, *priſtinam & immelioratam recipere merearis ſanitatem*; what was this but bodily health? and yet this was *per hanc Sacramenti Olei Unctionem:* after which follows a long Prayer for *Recovery* from *Pains and Diſeaſes.*

And ſuch there are in the ſeveral *Offices* publiſhed by *Menardus*, in his *Notes*; although the general ſtrain of them ſhews that they were of latter times, when the *Unction* was ſuppoſed to expiate the Sins of the ſeveral Senſes.

Caſſander produces many inſtances to ſhew, that the *Prayers* and *Hymns*, and the *Form* of anointing did reſpect *bodily health.* In one he finds this Form, *In nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti accipe ſanitatem.* Not the *health* of the *Mind*, but the *Body.* Caſſand. *not. in* Hymn. *p.* 288.

Maldonat takes notice of *Caſſander*'s Offices, and the expreſſions uſed in them; but he gives no anſwer to the main deſign of them. But three things he owns the *Church* of *Rome* to have varied from the *ancient Tradition* in, with reſpect to this *Sacrament.* 1. As to the *Form*; the Council of *Trent* owns no other but that now uſed, *Per iſtam Unctionem, &c.* but *Maldonat* confeſſes it was Indicative, *Ego te ungo, &c.* or *Ungo te Oleo ſancto, &c.* and he runs to that ſhift, *that Chriſt did not not determin any certain Form*; whereas the *Council* of *Trent* ſaith, *the Church underſtood by Tradition the other to have been the Form.* Here the *Council* of *Trent* makes an appeal to *Tradition*, and is deſerted in it, by one of its moſt zealous defenders; and *Gamachæus* affirms this to be *an eſſential Change*; and he thinks the *Sacrament* not to be valid in another *Form.* *Suarez* thinks *the other Form not ſufficient.* But *Maldonat* affirms *the other Form was uſed*; and ſo at that time, there was no *Sacrament* Maldonat. *de Sacramen. extr. Unct. q.* 1. Gamach. *de Extr. Unct. c.* 3. Suarez *in* 3. *part. Diſp.* 42. *ſect.* 3.

of

of *extreme Unction*, becauſe not adminiſtred in a valid or ſufficient *Form*. And yet in the *Gregorian Office* the *Form* is *Indicative*, *Inungo te de Oleo ſancto*, *&c.* So in that of *Ratoldus*, *Ungo te Oleo ſanctificato in nomine Patris*, *&c.* In the *Tilian Codex*, *Inungo te in nomine Patris*, *& Filii*, *& Spiritus Sancti*, *Oleo ſancto atque ſacrato*, *&c.* In the *Codex Remigii* the general *Forms* are *Indicative*, *Ungo te Oleo ſancto*, *&c.* but there being a variety of *Forms* ſet down, among the reſt there is one, *Per iſtam Unctionem Dei*, *&c.* Which afterwards came to be the ſtanding Form; and yet the Council of *Trent* confidently appeals to *Tradition* in this matter. Which ſhewed how very little the *Divines* there met were skilled in the *Antiquities* of their own *Church*. *Suarez* ſhews his skill when he ſaith, *the Tradition of the Roman Church is infallible in the Subſtance of this Sacrament, and that it always uſed a deprecative Form*; but *Maldonat* knew better, and therefore on their own grounds their *Tradition* was more than fallible; ſince the Roman Church hath actually changed the *Form* of this *Sacrament*. 2. *Maldonat* obſerves another *change*, and that is as to the *Seaſon* of adminiſtring it. For the *Council* of *Trent* ſaith it ought to be in *Exitu Vitæ*, and therefore it is called *Sacramentum Exeuntium*, *the Sacrament of dying Perſons*; but *Maldonat* ſaith, *it is an abuſe to give it only to ſuch*; *for*, *in the ancient Church*, *they did not wait till the party were near death*; *but*, he ſaith, *it was given before the Euchariſt*, *and that not once*, *but for ſeven days together*, *as is plain*, he ſaith, *in the ancient MS. Offices*; and he quotes *Albertus Magnus* for it. So that here is another great *change* in the *Roman Tradition* obſerved and owned by him. 3. In not giving it now to Children; for in the ancient Writers he ſaith, *there is no exception*, *but it was uſed to all that were ſick*; and he quotes *Cuſanus* for ſaying

Greg. *Sacr.* *p.* 252.
Menard. *Not.* *p.* 337.
p. 342.
p. 353.
p. 352.
Suarez *ibid.*
ib. 3.
Mald. *ib.* *q.* 3

saying expresly *that it was anciently administred to Infants.* But the reason of the *change* was the Doctrin of the *Schoolmen*; for with their admirable Congruities they had fitted *Sacraments* for all sorts of sins; as *Bellarmin* informs us; *Baptism* against *Original Sin*, *Confirmation* against *Infirmity*, *Penance* against *actual Mortal Sin*, *Eucharist* against *Malice*, *Orders* against *Ignorance*, *Matrimony* against *Concupiscence*; and what is now left for *Extreme Unction? Bellarmin* saith, *they are the Remainders of sin*; and so saith the Council of *Trent*. But what *Remainders* are there in Children, who have not actually sinned, and *Original sin* is done away already? Therefore the Church of *Rome* did wisely take away *Extreme Unction* from Children; but therein *Maldonat* confesses it is gone off from Tradition. I know *Alegambe* would have *Maldonat* not believed to be the Author of the *Books* of the *Sacraments*; but the Preface before his Works hath cleared this beyond contradiction from the *MSS.* taken from his Mouth with the day and year compared with the Copy printed under his Name. But if *Maldonat* may be believed, the Church of *Rome* hath notoriously gone off from its own *Tradition* as to this Sacrament of *Extreme Unction.*

Bell. de Sacr. l. 2. c. 26.

c. 2.

Of Matrimony.

The last new *Sacrament* is that of *Matrimony*; which having its institution in *Paradise*, one would wonder how it came into mens heads to call it *a Sacrament of the New Law, instituted by Christ*; especially when the *Grace* given by it supposes Mankind in a fallen condition. Hower the Council of *Trent* denounces an *Anathema against him that saith that Matrimony is not truly*

Conc. Trid. Sess. 24. c. 1.

and properly a Sacrament, one of the Seven of the Evangelical Law, inſtituted by Chriſt.

That which is *truly* and *properly* a *Sacrament* muſt be a *Cauſe* of *Grace*, according to the general Decrees about the *Nature* of *Sacraments*. So that thoſe who do not hold the latter, muſt deny the former.

Now that there was no Tradition even in the *Roman Church* for this, I prove from the *Confeſſion* of their own moſt learned *Divines* ſince the *Council* of *Trent*.

Vaſq. *de Sacr. Matrim. Diſp.* 2. *c.* 1. *Vaſquez* confeſſes that *Durandus* denies *that it confers Grace*, and conſequently that it is truly a Sacrament, (but he yields it in a large improper ſenſe) *and that the Canoniſts were of his Opinion; and that the Maſter of the Sentences himſelf aſſerted no more than* Durandus. And *c.* 3. which adds more to this, he confeſſes that *Soto* durſt not condemn this Opinion as *heretical*, becauſe *Thomas*, *Bonaventure*, *Scotus* and other *Schoolmen* did only look on their own as the more probable Opinion. But, ſaith he, *after the Decree of* Eugenius *and the Council of* Trent *it is heretical.*

Greg. de Val. *To.* 4. *Diſp.* 10. *Punct.* 5. *Gregory de Valentia* ſaith *the ſame thing*, only he adds *that the Maſter of the Sentences contradicts himſelf.* So certain a deliverer was he of the *Churches Tradition*; and wonders that *Soto* ſhould not find it plainly enough in the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*, that *a true Sacrament muſt confer Grace.*

Mald. *de Sac. Matrim. q.* 1. *Maldonat* yields, *that* Durandus *and the Canoniſts denied Matrimony to be a proper Sacrament*, but he calls them *Catholicks imprudently erring.*

Bell. *de Matr. Sacr. l. c.* 5. *Bellarmin* denies it not; but uſes a diſingenuous ſhift about *Durandus*, and would bring it to a *Logical Nicity*, whereas the very Arguments he pretends to anſwer, ſhew plainly that he denied this to be *a true and proper Sacrament.*

But

But he offers ſomething conſiderable about the *Canoniſts* if it will hold.

1. *That they were but a few*, and for this he quotes *Navarr, that the common Opinion was againſt them*; for which he mentions the *Rubrick de Sponſ.* but I can find nothing like it through the whole *Title*; and it is not at all probable that ſuch Men as *Hoſtienſis* and the *Gloſſer* ſhould be ignorant of, or oppoſe the common Opinion. *Hoſtienſis* ſaith plainly, *that Grace is not conferr'd by Matrimony*, and never once mentions any *Opinion* among them againſt it; and the *Gloſſer* upon *Gratian* affirms it ſeveral times, *Cauſ. 32. q. 2 c. Honorantur, In hoc Sacramento non confertur Gratia Spiritus Sancti ſicut in aliis.* The *Roman Correctors* could not bear this; and ſay in the Margin, *immo confert*; this is plain contradicting; but how is it proved from the *Canon Law*? They refer to *Diſt. 23. c. his igitur, v. pro beneficiis.* Thither upon their Authority I go; and there I find the very ſame thing ſaid, and in the ſame words; and it is given as a Reaſon *why Symony cannot be committed in Matrimony as in other Sacraments*, and in both places we are referr'd to *32 q. 2. c. connubia*, and to *1. q. 1. c. quicquid inviſibilis*, the former is not very favourable to the *Grace* of *Matrimony*; and in the latter the *Gloſs* is yet more plain, if it be poſſible, *Nota Conjugium non eſſe de his Sacramentis quæ conſolationem cœleſtis gratiæ tribuunt.* There the *Correctors* fairly refer us to the Council of *Trent*, which hath decreed the contrary. But that is not to our buſineſs, but whether the *Canoniſts* owned this or not. And there it follows, *that other Sacraments do ſo ſignifie as to convey, this barely ſignifies.* So that I think *Bellarmin* had as good have given up the *Canoniſts*, as to make ſo lame a Defence of them.

Navar. *Man. c. 22. n. 20.*

Hoſtienſ. *Sum. de Sacr. non iter. n. 7.*

Durand. *in sent. l.4. Dist. 26. q. 3.*

2. He saith *we are not to rely on the Canonists for these things, but on the Divines.* But *Durandus* saith, *the Canonists could not be ignorant of the Doctrin of the Roman Church; for some of them were Cardinals*; and he gives a better Reason, *viz. that the sense of the Roman Church was to be seen in the Decretals.* For therefore Marriage was owned to be a Sacrament in the large sense, because of the *Decret.* of *Lucius* III. *Extra de haeret. c. ad abolendam*; but the *Schoolmen* argued from Probabilities and Niceties in this matter, which could not satisfie a Man's understanding; as appears by *Durandus* his Arguments, and *Bellarmin*'s Answers to them.

1. *Where Sacraments confer Grace, there must be a Divine Institution of something above Natural Reason, but there is nothing of that kind in Matrimony, besides the signifying the Union between Christ and his Church; and therefore it is only a Sacrament in a large, and not in a proper sense.*

Bell. *de Sacr. Matr. l.1. c.5.*

In answer to this *Bellarmin* saith, *that it both signifies and causes such a Love between Man and Wife, as there is between Christ and his Church.*

Vasq. *da Sacr. Matr. Disp.2. c.6.*

But *Vasquez* saith, *that the Resembiance as to Christ and his Church in Matrimony, doth not at all prove a promise of Grace made to it.* And *Basilius Pontius* approves of what *Vasquez* saith, and confesses, *that it cannot be infer'd from hence that it is a true and proper Sacrament.*

Basil. Pont. *de Matr. l.1. c. 5. n. 10.*

2. *Here is nothing External added, besides the mere Contract of the Persons; but the nature of a Sacrament implies some external and visible sign.*

Bellarmin answers, *that it is not necessary there should be in this Sacrament any such extrinsecal sign; because it lies in a mere Contract.* And that I think holds on the other side, that a mere *Contract* cannot be a *Sacrament*, from their own Definition of a *Sacrament*.

3. *The*

3. *The Marriage of Infidels was good and valid, and their Baptism adds nothing to it; but it was no Sacrament before, and therefore not after.*

Bellarmin answers, *that it becomes a Sacrament after.* And so there is a *Sacrament* without either *Matter* or *Form*; for there is no new Marriage.

4. *Marriage was instituted in the time of Innocency, and is a natural Dictate of Reason,* and therefore no Sacrament.

Bellarmin answers, *that it was no Sacrament then, because there was no need of Sacramental Grace. And although the Marriage of* Adam *and* Eve *did represent the Union between Christ and his Church; yet it was no proper Sacrament.* But how doth it prove that it is a *Sacrament* upon any other Account, under the Gospel? And if that doth not imply a promise of *Grace,* then how can it now?

So that *Durandus* his Reasons appear much stronger than *Bellarmin*'s Answers.

But *Durandus* urges one thing more, which *Bellarmin* takes no notice of, viz. *that this Opinion of the Canonists was very well known at that time, and was never condemned as contrary to any determination of the Church.* Now, if there had been any constant *Tradition* even of the Church of *Rome* against it, it is impossible these *Canonists* should have avoided Censure; their Opinion being so much taken notice of by the Schoolmen afterwards. *Jacobus Almain* saith, *it was a Controversie between the Canonists and Divines, whether Matrimony was a Sacrament*; not all the Divines neither; for he confesses *Durandus and others seemed to agree with them.* What *Universal Tradition* then had the Council of *Trent* to rely upon in this matter? When *all the Canonists,* according to *Almain,* and *some of the Divines,* opposed it? He sets down their

Almain *in* 4. *Dist.* 26. *q.* 1.

diffe-

different Reaſons; but never alledges matter of *Faith*, or *Tradition* againſt them, but only ſaith, *the Divines hold the other Opinion, becauſe Matrimony is one of the Seven Sacraments.* But on what was the Opinion of the Neceſſity of *Seven Sacraments* grounded? What Scripture, what Fathers, what Tradition was there, before *Peter Lombard*, for juſt that number?

The Senſe of the Greek *Church about Seven Sacraments.*

But before I come to that, it is fit to take notice of what *Bellarmin* lays great weight upon, both as to the Number of the Sacraments in general, and this in particular; which is, *the conſent of both the* Greek *and* Latin *Church for at leaſt* 500 *Years.* But I have ſhewed there was no ſuch Conſent, as is boaſted of even in the *Latin* Church. *As to the* Greek *Church*, he ſaith, *it is an argument of Univerſal Tradition, when they had the ſame Tradition even in their Schiſm.*

B. de Sacr. l. 2. c. 25.

De Matrim. Sacr. l. 1. c. 4.

To this I Anſwer.

1. We do not deny that the latter *Greeks*, after the taking *Conſtantinople* by the *Latins*, did hold *Seven Myſteries*; which the *Latins* render *Sacraments.* For after there were *Latin Patriarchs* at *Conſtantinople*, and abundance of *Latin Prieſts* in the *Eaſtern Parts*, they had perpetual Diſputes about Religion; and the *Latins* by degrees did gain upon them in ſome points; and particularly in this of *Seven Sacraments*, for the *Latins* thought it an advantage to their Church to boaſt of ſuch a Number of *Sacraments*; and the *Greeks* that they might not ſeem to come behind them, were willing to embrace the ſame Number.

The

The first Person among them who is said to have written about them, was *Simeon* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, whom *Possevin* sets at a greater distance, that the *Tradition* might seem so much elder among them; (for he makes him to have lived 600 years before his time;) but *Leo Allatius* hath evidently proved, that he lived not two hundred years before him, (which is a considerable difference,) for *Simeon* dyed but six months before the taking of *Thessalonica*, *A.D.* 1430, as he proves from *Joh. Anagnosta*, who was present at the taking it. From hence it appers how very late this *Tradition* came into the *Greek Church*.

Possev. *in Appar.*

Leo Allat. *de Concord. l.* 2. *c.* 18. *n.* 13. *De* Simeon. *Script. p.* 185. *&c.*

After him *Gabriel Severus*, Bishop of *Philadelphia*, wrote about the *Seven Sacraments*, and he lived at *Venice* in *Arcudius* his time, who wrote since *Possevin*; and *Crusius* wrote to this *Gabriel A. D.* 1580, and he was consecrated by *Jeremias A. D.* 1577. So that neither his *Authority*, or that of *Jeremias*, can signifie any thing as to the *Antiquity* of this *Tradition* among the *Greeks*.

Crusii *Turco Græc.*

Leo Allatius talks of *the old as well as Modern Greeks, who held Seven Sacraments*, but he produces the Testimony only of those who lived since the taking of *Constantinople*; as *Job the Monk*, *Simeon*, *Johannes Palæologus*, *Jeremias*, *Gabriel*, *Cyrillus Berrhoensis*, *Parthenius*, and such like: But he very craftily saith, *he produces these to let us see they have not gone off from the Faith of their Ancestors*, whereas that is the thing we would have seen, *viz.* the Testimony of the *Greeks* before, and not afterwards. As to the *ancient Greeks*, he confesses *they say nothing of the number. De numero apud eos altum silentium est.* And how could there be a *Tradition* in so much silence? *But some speak of some, and others of others, but all speak of all.* This is a very odd way to prove a *Tradition* of a certain Number. For then, some might believe

Leo Allat. *de Concord. l.* 3. *c.* 16. *n.* 4.

n. 9.

believe Three, others Four, others Five, but how can this prove that all believed juſt *Seven?* However let us ſee the Proof. But inſtead of that he preſently ſtarts an *Objection from the pretended* Dionyſius Areopagita, viz. *That where he deſigns to treat of all the Sacraments, he never mentions Penance, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony*; and after a great deal of rambling Diſcourſe, he concludes *that he did ill to leave them out; and that others Anſwers are inſufficient.* He ſhews from *Tertullian, Ambroſe* and *Cyril that the neceſſary Sacraments are mentioned*; but where are the reſt? and we are now enquiring after them in the ancient *Greek Church*; but they are not to be found. As one may confidently affirm, when one who profeſſed ſo much skill in the *Greek Church*, as *Leo Allatius*, hath no more to ſay for the Proof of it.

n. 10.
n. 15.
n. 17.

2. Thoſe Greeks who held *Seven Sacraments*, did not hold them in the Senſe of the *Council* of *Trent*. And that for two Reaſons.

1. They do not hold them all to be of *divine Inſtitution*. Which appears by the Patriarch *Jeremias* his Anſwer to the *Tubing Divines*, who at firſt ſeems to write agreeably to the Church of *Rome* in this matter, (except about Extreme Unction;) but being preſſed hard by them in their Reply; he holds *to the Divine Inſtitution of Baptiſm, and the Euchariſt*, but gives up the reſt, *as inſtituted by the Churches Authority*. Which is plain giving up the Cauſe. How then comes *Bellarmin* to inſiſt ſo much on the Anſwer of *Jeremias?* The Reaſon was, that *Socolovius* had procured from *Conſtantinople* the *Patriarch's firſt anſwer*, and tranſlated and printed it; upon which great Triumphs were made of the *Patriarch's Conſent* with the Church of *Rome*; but when theſe *Divines* were hereby provoked to publiſh the whole proceedings,

Act. Theolog. Wirtemberg. p. 240.

ceedings, those of the Church of *Rome* were unwilling to be undeceived; and so take no notice of any farther Answer. Since the time of *Jeremias*, the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, (as he was afterwards,) *Metrophanes Critopulus* published an Account of the Faith of the *Greek Church*; and he saith expressly of Four of the Seven, *that they are Mystical Rites, and equivocally called Sacraments.* And from hence it appears how little Reason *Leo Allatius* had to be angry with *Caucus*, a Latinized Greek, like himself, for affirming *that the modern Greeks did not look on these Sacraments as of Divine Institution*; but after he hath given him some hard words, he offers to prove his Assertion for him. To which end he not only quotes that passage of the Patriarch *Jeremias*, but others of *Job* and *Gregorius*; from whence he infers, *that Five of the Sacraments were of Ecclesiastical Institution*, and he saith nothing to take it off. So admirably hath he proved the *Consent* of the *Eastern* and *Western Churches!*

Metroph. *Confess. Eccl.* Orient. *p.* 74.

Leo Allat. *de Concord. Eccl.* Occident. & Orient. *l.* 3. *c.* 17.

2. They do not agree in the *Matter*, or *Form*, or some essential part of them, with the Council of *Trent*, and therefore can make up no *Tradition* for the *Doctrin* of that *Council* about the *Seven Sacraments*. This will be made appear by going through them.

1. *Of Chrism.*

1. As to the *Form*, *Arcudius* shews, *that* Gabriel *of* Philadelphia, Cabasilas *and* Marcus Ephesius, *all place the Form in the Consecration of it*; but the *Church* of *Rome* makes the *Form* to lie in the *Words spoken in the Use of it.*

Arcud. *de Concord. l.* 2. *c.* 6.

2. As to the *Minister* of it. Among the *Greeks* it is commonly performed by the *Presbyter*, though the *Bishop be present*; but the *Council* of *Trent* denounces an

Concil. Trid. de Confirm. Can. 3. De Sacram. Can. 9. *Anathema* against him that saith, *the Bishop alone is not the ordinary Minister of it.*

3. As to the *Character*. The Council of *Trent* declares *that whosoever affirms that Confirmation doth not imprint an indelible Character, so as it cannot be repeated is Anathematized*; but *Arcudius* shews at large, that the *modern Greeks* make no scruple of *reiterating Confirmation*. But *Catumsyritus*, another *Latinized Greek*, opposes *Arcudius* herein; and saith, *that the Use of Chrism among the Greeks, doth not relate to the Sacrament of Confirmation, but was a Symbolical Ceremony relating to Baptism*; and for this he quotes one *Corydaleus* a Man of great Note in the *Patriarchal Church* at *Constantinople*. Therefore *Caucus* had reason to deny that the Greeks receive that which the Latins call the Sacrament of Confirmation. And if this hold, then the *Tradition* of the *Seven Sacraments* must fail in the *Greek Church*. For they deny that they have any such thing as a *Sacrament* of *Confirmation* distinct from *Baptism*.

Arcud. l. 2. c. 18, 19, 20, &c. Catumsyrit. *Vera utriusq; Eccl. Concord. Proleg.* p. 114.

2. *Of the Sacrament of Penance.*

Concil. Trid. de Pœnit. c. 6. can. 9. 1. The Council of *Trent* declares *Absolution of the Penitent to be a judicial Act, and denounces an Anathema against him that denies it*; but the *Greek Church* uses a *deprecative Form*, (as they call it,) not pronouncing *Absolution* by way of *Sentence*, but by way of *Prayer to God*. Which as *Aquinas* observes, *rather shews a Person to be absolved by God than by the Priest, and are rather a Prayer that it may be done, than a signification that it is done*; and therefore he looks on such *Forms* as insufficient. And if it be a *judicial Sentence*, as the Council of *Trent* determines, it can hardly be reconciled to such a *Form*, wherein no kind of *judicial Sentence* was ever pronounced; as

Aq. 3. p. q. 84. a. 3. ad. 1.

Arcu-

Arcudius grants; and in *Extreme Unction*, where ſuch a *Form* is allowed, there is, as he obſerves, no *Judicial Act*. But he hopes at laſt to bring the *Greeks off* by a Phraſe uſed in ſome of their Forms, *I have you abſolved*; but he confeſſes it is not in their *Publick Offices*; and their Prieſts for the moſt part uſe it not. Which ſhews it to be an Innovation among the *Latinizing Greeks*, if it be ſo obſerved, which *Catumſyritus* denies, and ſaith, *he proves it only from ſome Forms granted by Patents*, which are not *Sacramental*; and ſuppoſing it otherwiſe, he ſaith, *it is fooliſh, falſe and erroneous to ſuppoſe ſuch a Form to be valid; becauſe it is no Judicial Act.*

Arcud *de Concord.* 4. *l.* *c.* 3. *p.* 360.

p. 370.

Catumſyritus *de vera Conc. Proleg. p.* 152.

2. The Council of *Trent* makes *Confeſſion* of all Mortal Sins, how ſecret ſoever, to be neceſſary in order to the benefit of *Prieſtly Abſolution* in this *Sacrament*, and denounces an *Anathema* againſt thoſe that deny it; but the *Greek Church* grants *Abſolution* upon ſuppoſition *that they have not confeſſed all Mortal Sins*: As appears by the Form of the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, produced by *Arcudius*, and another *Form* of the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, in *Jeremias* his Anſwer. *Arcudius* is hard put to it, when to excuſe this he ſaith, *they only pray to God to forgive them*; for this is to own that a *deprecative Form* is inſufficient, and ſo that there is no *Sacrament* of *Penance* in the *Greek Church.*

Concil. Trid. *de Pœnit. c.* 5.

Can. 7.

Arcud. *p.* 373.

3. *Of Orders.*

The *Greek* and *Latin Churches* differ, both as to *Matter and Form*. The Council of *Trent Anathematiſeth* thoſe *who deny a viſible and exeternal Prieſthood in the New Teſtament; or a Power of conſecrating and offering the true Body and Bloud of Chriſt, and of remitting and retaining*

Seſſ. 23. *de Sacr. Ordin. Can.* 1.

of Sins. And this two-fold *Power* the Church of *Rome* expreſſes by a double *Form*, one of *delivering the Veſſels with* Accipe Poteſtatem, &c. *the other of Impoſition of Hands, with* Accipe Spiritum Sanctum.

But the *Greek Church* wholly omits the former, on which the greateſt weight is laid in the *Latin Church*, and many think the *Eſſential Form* lies in it. When the *Office* of *Ordination* is over, the *Book* of the *Liturgy*, called κοντάκιον is delivered to the Presbyter, but without any words; and there is no mention of it in their *Rituals*, either Printed or MSS. ſo likewiſe a parcel of conſecrated Bread is delivered by the *Biſhop* to him afterwards. And all the Form is, *The Divine Grace advances ſuch an one to the Office of a Presbyter.*

If we compare this with the *Form* in the Council of *Florence*, we ſhall find no agreement either as to *Matter* or *Form*, in this Sacrament, between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches.* For there the *Matter* is ſaid to be *that by which the Order is conferred*, viz. *the delivery of the Chalice with Wine, and the Paten with the Bread*; and the *Form, Receive the Power of offering Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead.* And it is hardly poſſible to ſuppoſe theſe two Churches ſhould go upon the ſame *Tradition.* I know what pains *Arcudius* hath taken to reconcile them; but as long as the Decree of *Eugenius* ſtands, and is received in the Church of *Rome*, it is impoſſible. And *Catumſyritus* labours hard to prove, *that he hath endeavoured thereby to overthrow the whole Order of Prieſthood in the Roman Church.*

4. *Of*

4. *Of Extreme Unction.*

Bellarmin particularly appeals to the *Greek Church* for its consent as to this *Sacrament*; but if he means in the modern sense as it is deliver'd by the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*, he is extremely mistaken. Bell. *de Extr. Unct. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

1. For the former saith, *it is not to be given but to such of whose death they are afraid*; and the Council of *Trent* calls it *the Sacrament of dying Persons*. But the *Greeks* administer their *Sacrament* of *Unction* to *Persons in health* as well as sickness, and once a year to all the People that will; which *Arcudius* saith, *is not only done by the illiterate Priests, but by their Patriarchs and Metropolitans*, &c. and they look on then as *a Supplement to the ancient Penance of the Church*; for they think the partaking of *the holy Oil* makes amends for that: but this *Arcudius* condemns as an abuse and innovation among them. But the original Intention and Design of it was for the Cure and Recovery of sick Persons; as *Arcudius* confesses the whole scope of the *Office* shews; and in the next Chapter he produces the *Prayers* to that end. And the *Greeks* charge the *Latins* with *Innovation* in giving this *Sacrament* to those Persons of whose *Recovery* they have no hope. Arcud. *de Concord. l.* 5. *c.* 4. *p.* 389. *c.* 5. *c.* 7. *p.* 403.

2. The Council of *Trent* requires that the Oil of Extreme Unction be consecrated by a *Bishop*; and this the Doctors of the Roman Church, saith *Catumsyritus*, make *essential to the Sacrament*. But in the *Greek* Church the *Presbyters* commonly do it, as *Arcudius* shews at large. *Conc.* Trid. *de Extr. Unct. c.* 1. Catumsyr. *Vera Concord. Tr.* 1. *p.* 156. Arcud. *l.* 5. *c.* 2.

5. *Of*

5. *Of Matrimony.*

Conc. Trid. *Seſſ.* 24. *Can.* 7.

Bell. de Matr. l. 1. *c.* 16.

The Council of *Trent* from making this a *Sacrament*, denounces an *Anathema* againſt thoſe who do not hold the Bond indiſſoluble, even in the Caſe of Adultery. And *Bellarmin* urges this as his firſt Reaſon, *becauſe it is a ſign of the Conjunction of Chriſt with his Church.* But the *Greek Church* held the contrary; and continues ſo to do, as both *Bellarmin* and *Arcudius* confeſs.

So that though there be allow'd a conſent in the *Number* of *Sacraments* among the Modern *Greeks*, yet they have not an entire Conſent with the Roman Church in any one of them.

The Senſe of other Eaſtern Churches about the Seven Sacraments.

But to ſhew how late this Tradition of Seven Sacraments came into the *Greek Church*, and how far it is from being an *Univerſal Tradition*, I ſhall now make it appear that this Number of Sacraments was never received in the other Chriſtian Churches, although ſome of them were originally deſcended from the Ancient *Greek Church*.

I begin with the moſt *Eaſtern Churches*, called the *Chriſtians* of St. *Thomas* in the *Eaſt-Indies*. And we have a clear Proof that there was no Tradition among them about the Seven Sacraments. For when *Alexius Meneſes*, Archbiſhop of *Goa*, undertook to reform them according to the *Roman Church*, (if that may be called a *Reformation*) and held a Council at *Diamper* to that purpoſe, *A. D.* 1599. *he found that they had no Sacrament of Chriſm, or Penance, or Extreme Unction, of which they*

they were utterly ignorant, ſaith *Jarricus* from *Antonius Goveanus*, who was *Prior* of *Goa*, and publiſhed the whole proceedings. Which Book was tranſlated out of *Portugeſe* by *Joh. Baptiſta a Glano* into *French*, and printed at *Bruſſels*, 1609. From whence the Author of the *Critical Hiſtory* of the *Faith and Cuſtoms of the Eaſtern Nations* hath given an Account of theſe things; and he ſaith, *they owned but three Sacraments, Baptiſm, Euchariſt and Orders; that they knew nothing of the Sacrament of Chriſm or extreme Unction, and abhorred Auricular Confeſſion.* But in excuſe of them he ſaith, *that they joyned Confirmation with Baptiſm, as other Eaſtern Churches did; that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction as it is practiſed in the Church of* Rome *is known only to the Latin Church; but the Eaſtern Church had the Unction of S.* James *for the Cure of Diſeaſes, as the Greek Church had.*

Pet. Jarric. *Rer Indic. To.* 3. *p.* 2. *c.* 12.

Hiſtoire Critique, ch. 8. *p.* 104. *p.* 105. *p.* 112. *p.* 113. *p.* 13.

Cotovicus affirms the ſame of the other *Eaſtern Churches* called *Chaldean*, (who are under the ſame *Patriarch* with the Chriſtians of S. *Thomas*) *that they knew nothing of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme Unction.* This *Patriarch* is the ſame which is commonly called the *Patriarch* of *Babylon*; whoſe Reſidence is at *Mozal*; but called of *Babylon*, becauſe *Seleucia*, after the deſolation of the true *Babylon* had the name given to it (as it were eaſie to prove, if it were pertinent to this deſign) and upon the deſtruction of *Seleucia* the Patriarch removed firſt to *Bagdat* and then to *Mozal*; whoſe Juriſdiction extends over all thoſe *Eaſtern Chriſtians*, which are called *Neſtorian.*

Cotov. *Itin.* Hieroſol. & Syr. *p.* 206.

In the *Abyſſine Churches*, *Godignus* ſaith poſitively from thoſe who had been converſant among them, *that they knew nothing of the Sacraments of Chriſm and Extreme Unction; and that all the Confeſſion they have is general and rare; and that they have no Biſhops under the*

Godign. *de rebus Abaſſ. l.* 1. *c.* 35. *c.* 36.

the Abuna, *and believe the bond of Matrimony eaſily diſſolved.* So that the *Tradition* of *Seven Sacraments* is wholly unknown to them, but as it was impoſed by the *Roman Miſſionaries*; which impoſition was ſo ill received there, and brought ſuch Confuſion and Diſorders among them, that they are for ever baniſhed.

Clem. Galan. *Conc. Eccleſ. Arm. cum Rom. c.* 30. *p.* 516. In the *Armenian Churches*, *Joh. Chernacenſis* a *Latinized Armenian* faith, *that the Armenians owned not the Seven Sacraments, that they knew nothing of Chriſm and Extreme Unction.* Here we ſee a *general conſent* as to the total ignorance of two of the *Seven Sacraments* in theſe Churches. But *Clemens Galanus*, who had been many years a *Miſſionary* among the *Armenians* endeavours to prove *that they had the Tradition of the ſeven Sacraments*; but very unſucceſsfully. For he produces none of their ancient Authors for it: but he names *Vartanus* whom he ſets himſelf to confute afterwards; and he confeſſes, *that he took away the Sacrament of Penance, and made Burial of the Dead to be one of his ſeven.* But more than that, he ſaith, *the Armenian Churches have forbidden Extreme Unction as the Neſtorians had done Auricular Confeſſion.* So that nothing like a truly *Catholick Tradition* can be produced for the Number of *ſeven Sacraments* either in the Church of *Rome* or elſewhere, within *Bellarmin*'s own term of 500 years.

Clem. Galan. *To.* 3. *p.* 439.

p. 636.

p. 605.

I am now to give an account when this Number of *ſeven Sacraments*, came into the Church, and on what *Occaſions* it was advanced to be a point of Faith.

Hugo de S. Vict. *de Offic. l.* 1. *c.* 12. The firſt I can find who expreſly ſet down the Number of *ſeven Sacraments*, was *Hugo de S. Victore*, who lived in the *twelfth Century*, not long before *Peter Lombard*. But that there was an *Innovation* made by him in this matter, I ſhall make appear by comparing what he

he saith with what others had delivered who were short of the Primitive Fathers.

Rupertus Tuitiensis lived much about the same time in *Germany* that *Hugo* did at *Paris*, and he gives a different Resolution of the Question about the *Principal Sacraments*: For he names no more than *Baptism, the Eucharist and the double Gift of the Holy Ghost*; and, saith he, *these three Sacraments are necessary instruments of our Salvation.* But *Hugo* saith, *there are seven principal Sacraments*; (which sufficiently shews, that he thought there were other *Sacraments* besides these; and so he expresses his mind in another place, where he makes all *Symbolical Signs* to be *Sacraments*,) but the *principal Sacraments* he saith, *are those which convey Grace.*

Rup. Tuit. *de Vit. Verbi. l.* 12. *c.* 11.

Hugo *de Sac. l.* 1. *part.* 9. *c.* 6, 7.

Fulbertus Carnotensis lived in *France* in the beginning of the *tenth Century*; and where he Discourses of the *Sacraments* he names no more than *Baptism and the Eucharist.* He calls *the Body and Blood two Sacraments*, and so did *Rabanus Maurus* before him.

Fulb. Carnot. *Epist.* 1.

De Inst. Cler. l. 1. *c.* 31.

Who lived in the ninth Age, and was a Person of great Reputation; and he names no more *Sacraments* than *Baptism*, and *Chrism*, and the *Eucharist*; where he proposes to treat of them; and had as just an Occasion to have mention'd the rest, as *Hugo* had. But *Bellarmin* saith, *he handled all wherein the Clergy were concerned, and therefore omitted none but Matrimony.* But were not they concerned to know whether it were a *Sacrament* or not? The Question is not whether he mention'd the things, but whether he called them *Sacraments*; but I do not find *Extreme Unction* so much as mention'd by him in the place he refers us to.

Rab. Maur. *de Inst. Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 24.

Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 2. *c.* 27.

In the same Age, *Walafridus Strabo*, where he purposely discourseth of the *Sacraments* names no more than *Rabanus Maurus*; and this had been an inexcusable

Walaf. Strab. *de Reb. Eccl. c.* 16, 17, 25.

omiſſion in ſuch who treat of *Eccleſiaſtical Offices*; and were to inform Perſons of their duties about them And therefore I lay much more weight on ſuch an omiſſion in them than in any other Writers. I know *Paſchaſius Radbertus* mentions no more than *three Sacraments, Baptiſm, Chriſm and the Euchariſt*; but *Bellarmin* and *Sirmondus* ſay *he mention'd them for Example ſake*, becauſe it was not his buſineſs to handle the Number of *Sacraments*; but this Anſwer will by no means ſerve for thoſe who purpoſely treated of theſe matters; and therefore an omiſſion in them is an argument that they knew nothing of them.

Paſch. Radb. *de corp. & ſang. Dom. c.* 3.

Iſid. *Orig. l.* 6. *de Officiis.*

And this Argument will go yet higher; for in the beginning of the *ſeventh Century*, *Iſidore* of *Sevil* treated of theſe matters, and he names no more than *Baptiſm*, *Chriſm* and the *Euchariſt*; and he tells us, *they are therefore called Sacraments, becauſe under the covering of corporeal things a ſecret and inviſible virtue is convey'd to the partakers of them.* And this very paſſage is entred into the *Canon Law c.* 1. *q.* 1 *c. Multi Secularium*, &c. and there it paſſes under the Name of *Gregory* I. but the *Roman Correctors* reſtore it to *Iſidore.*

Ivo *Decret* 2. *p. c.* 73.

But it may be objected, that *Ivo Carnotenſis* made a Collection of *Canons* before *Gratian*; who handles the *Sacraments* in his firſt and ſecond Part; and he ſeems to make the *annual Chriſm* to be a *Sacrament*; for which he quotes an Epiſtle of *Fabianus*, who ſaith it ought to be conſecrated every year, *quia novum Sacramentum eſt*; and this, he ſaith, *he had by Tradition from the Apoſtles.* Which Teſtimony the modern Schoolmen rely upon for a ſufficient proof of this *Apoſtolical Tradition.* But this Epiſtle is a notorious counterfeit, and rejected by all men of any tolerable Ingenuity in the Church of *Rome.* Thus we trace the *Original* of ſome pretended *Apoſtolical Tradi-*

Yſamb. *ad. q.* 72. *Diſp.* 1. *A.* 3.

Traditions into that Maſs of *Forgeries*, the *Decretal Epiſtles*, which was ſent abroad under the Name of *Iſidore*.

Ivo produces another Teſtimony from *Innocentius* I. to prove *that Extreme Unction was then owned for a kind of Sacrament, and therefore ought not to be given to Penitents.* If this Rule holds, then either *Matrimony* was no *Sacrament*, or *Penitents* might not marry; but the *Canoniſts* ſay even excommunicated Perſons may marry, but one of them ſaith *it is a ſtrange Sacrament excommunicated Perſons are allow'd to partake of.* Ivo *ib. c.* 75: Alex. *Conſil.*

But this *genus eſt Sacramenti* ſignifies very little to thoſe who know how largely the Word *Sacrament* was uſed in elder times, from *Tertullian* downwards. But our Queſtion is not about *a kind of a Sacrament*, but *ſtrict and proper Sacraments*; and if it had been then thought ſo, he would not have permitted any to adminiſter it; unleſs they will ſay it is as neceſſary to Salvation as *Baptiſm*, which none do. It appears from hence, that there was then a Cuſtome among ſome in regard to S. *James* his Words, if Perſons were ſick, to take ſome of the *Chriſm* to anoint them, and to pray over them in hopes of their Recovery; but this was no *Sacrament* of *dying Perſons*, as it is now in the Church of *Rome*.

If it had been then ſo eſteemed, S. *Ambroſe* (or whoever was the Author of the Book of *Sacraments*) would not have omitted it, and the other ſupernumeraries, when he purpoſely treats of *Sacraments*; the ſame holds as to S. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*. And it is a poor evaſion to ſay, *that they ſpake only to Catechumens*; for they were to be inſtructed in the Means and Inſtruments of Salvation as they make all *Sacraments* to be.

And it is to as little purpoſe to ſay, *that they do not declare there are but two*; for our buſineſs is to enquire for a *Catholick Tradition for ſeven true and proper Sacraments*, , as the *Council* of *Trent* determines under an *Anathema*. But if we compare the Traditions for two and for ſeven together, the other will be found to have far greater Advantage; not only becauſe the two are mention'd in the eldeſt Writers, where the ſeven are not; but becauſe ſo many of the Fathers agree in the Tradition, *that the Sacraments were deſigned by the Water and Blood which came out of our Saviour's ſide.* So S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *Leo Magnus*, but above all S. *Auguſtin* who ſeveral times inſiſts upon this; which ſhews that they thought thoſe two to be the *true and proper Sacraments* of Chriſtianity; however there might be other *Myſtical Rites* which in a large ſenſe might be called *Sacraments*.

S. Chryſ. *in* Joh. *hom.* 87.
S. Cyril. *in* Joh. *l.* 12.
Leo *in Epiſt. ad* Flavian.
S. Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 9. 15.
in Pſ. 40
De Civit. Dei, l. 15. *c.* 26.
De Symbol. c. 6.

As to the *Occaſions* of ſetting up this Number of *ſeven Sacraments*, they were theſe.

1. Some pretty *Congruities* which they had found out for them. The *Number ſeven* they obſerve was in requeſt in the *Levitical Law*, as to *Sacrifices* and *Purifications*. *Naaman* was bid to waſh ſeven times. And *Bellarmin* in good earneſt concludes *that the whole Scripture ſeemed to foretell the ſeven Sacraments by thoſe things.* But beſides, he tells us of *the ſeven things relating to natural Life which theſe have an Analogy with*; *the ſeven ſorts of ſins theſe are a remedy againſt*, *and the ſeven ſorts of Vertues which anſwer to the ſeven Sacraments.* But none of all theſe prove any *Catholick Tradition.*

Bell. *de Sacr. l.* 2. *c.* 26.

2. Making no difference between *Myſtical Rites* continued in Imitation of Apoſtolical Practices, and *true and real*

real Sacraments. Imposition of Hands for *Confirmation* and *Ordination* is allowed to be a very just and reasonable Imitation of them; and as long as the *Miraculous Power* of *Healing* Diseases continued, there was a fair Ground for continuing the Practice mentioned by *S. James*; but there was no Reason afterwards to change this into quite another thing, by making it a *Sacrament*, chiefly intended for doing away the Remainders of Sin.

3. Advancing the Honour of the Priesthood; by making them so necessary for the actual Expiation of all sorts of Sins, and in all conditions. For no *Sacrament* is rightly administred by the Council of *Trent* without the *Priest*; and therefore clandestine *Marriages* are declared void by it. And it pronounces an *Anathema* against those *who say any others than Priests can administer Extreme Unction*; however it appears that in the time of *Innocentius* 1. any might make use of the *Chrism* when it was consecrated by a Bishop; but they are grown wiser in the Church of *Rome* since that time; and as they have altered a Ceremony of *Curing* into a *Sacrament* of *Dying*, so they have taken Care that none but Priests shall perform that last Office, that the People may believe they can neither live nor dye without them.

VI. Of Auricular Confession.

The Council of *Trent* declares, *that the Universal Church always understood that Christ did institute an entire Confession of Sins; and that it is received by Divine Right to all who sin after Baptism, because our Lord Jesus Christ before his Ascension into Heaven, did leave Priests as his Vicars, to be Presidents and Judges, to whom all mortal sins were to be made known, and of which they were by the*

Concil. Trid. *Sess.* 14. *de Pœnit. c.* 5.

The Power of the Keys to give Sentence, ſo as either to remit or retain them.

Ib. It farther ſaith, *That the moſt holy and ancient Fathers by a great and unanimous Conſent did uſe this ſecret Sacramental Confeſſion from the beginning.*

And it denounces *Anathema's*,

Can. 1. 1. *Againſt him that denies the Sacrament of Penance to be of Chriſt's Inſtitution.*

3. 2. *Againſt him that denies that our Saviour's words, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt, Whoſe ſins ye remit they are remitted*, &c. *are to be underſtood of the Power of remitting and retaining in the Sacrament of* Penance, *as the Calick Church always underſtood them.*

4, 6, 7. 3. *Againſt him that denies Confeſſion to be a Part of it, or to have Divine Inſtitution, and to be neceſſary to Salvation; as it relates to all mortal though ſecret Sins.*

Thus we ſee the Senſe of the *Council* of *Trent* in this matter; and I ſhall now make it evident there was no ſuch *Catholick Tradition*, as is here pretended for it, by the Confeſſion of their own Writers.

1. As to the General Senſe of the Church.
2. As to the Founding it on *John* 22. *Thoſe ſins ye remit*, &c.

1. As to the General Senſe of the Church. *Maldonat* reckons up Seven ſeveral Opinions among themſelves about *Confeſſion*. 1. *Of thoſe who denied it to be of Divine Right, but held it to be uſeful in the Church*; and for this he quotes *Rhenanus* and *Eraſmus*. 2. *Of thoſe who make it to be onely of Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution; and this*, ſaith he, *is the Opinion of all the Canoniſts*. 3. *Of thoſe who thought it came in by Apoſtolical Tradition*; of which he reckons *Theodore* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, 4. *Of ſome Divines*

Maldonat *de Sacr. Pœnit. De Confeſſ. c.* 2.

Divines who held it to be inſtituted only by St. James. 5. *Of others who held it to be of Divine Right, and not inſtituted by the Apoſtles, but inſinuated by Chriſt*; and for this he quotes *Alexander Hales*, and *Bonaventure*. 6. *Of ſome who thought it inſtituted in the Old Teſtament*. 7. *Of thoſe who held it inſtituted by Chriſt, but not as a Precept, but by way of Council*; and for this he mentions *Scotus* and his Followers.

Vaſquez reckons up among thoſe whoſe Opinions are not condemned, The *Canoniſts*, *Eraſmus*, *Bonaventure*, *Alexander Hales*, and *Scotus*, who all differed from the Council of *Trent*. Vaſquez *in* 3. Th. *To.* 4. *Q.* 90. *art.* 1. *n.* 4.

Suarez mentions three Opinions among them. 1. *Of thoſe who ſaid it was inſtituted in the Law of Nature*. 2. *Of thoſe who attributed it to the Law of* Moſes. 3 *Of thoſe who d nyed any Inſtitution of it by way of Precept from Chriſt in the Law of Grace*; and for this he quotes *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, *Alexander Hales*, and *Bonaventure*, and they went upon this Ground, *that no ſuch Inſtitution could be proved either by Scripture or Tradition*. Suarez *in* 3. *p.* Th. *To.* 4. *Diſp.* 35. § 1.

Gregory de Valentia Confeſſes, *ſome Catholick Authors denied the Divine Inſtitution of Confeſſion*; for which he produces the *Canoniſts*, and *Eraſmus* and *Rhenanus*. But he thinks *they were not guilty of Hereſie, becauſe they were not obſtinate*; but that is not our buſineſs, which is to ſhew, that by their own confeſſion there was not a conſtant *Catholick Tradition* in the Church about it. Greg. de Valent. *To.* 4. *Diſp.* 7. *Q.* 9. *Punct.* 2.

Natalis Alexander, who hath lately pretended to anſwer *Daillè*, confeſſes, *that from the ninth to the thirteenth Age, many Catholicks did hold, that Confeſſion to God alone was ſufficient to obtain Remiſſion of ſins*; and he proves it from *Lombard*, *Gratian* and the *Canoniſts*. But he ſaith *it was no hereſie in them, the point not being yet ſettled by a general Council*. Nat. Alex. *de Sacr. Confeſſ. p.* 229.

Boileau

Hiſt. Confeſ. Auric. c. 29.

Boileau in his Anſwer to *Daillè* cannot deny *that in the time of* Lombard *and* Gratian *men held ſeveral ways about this matter*; but he anſwers with *Thomas* upon the *Sentences*; that *it was an opinion then, but ſince the Council of* Lateran *it is become a Hereſie.* But if it were no heretical Opinion then, what becomes of *Infallible Tradition?* If the Church defines by *Tradition*, that *Tradition* muſt be proved before the *Definition*, otherwiſe it hath no ground to proceed upon.

The Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* III. (it ſeems) made it *a Hereſie* to deny this *Sacramental Confeſſion.* Within much leſs than a Century before it, lived *Peter Lombard* and *Gratian. Peter Lombard* made it his buſineſs to collect a Body of Divinity out of the *Sentences* of the *Fathers*; and his work hath been univerſally eſteemed in the *Roman Church.* When he comes to ſtate this point of *Confeſſion* out of the *Fathers*, *i. e.* to give an account of the *Tradition* of the Church about it; he tells us in the beginning, *that learned men were of different opinions*; and for what reaſon? *becauſe the Doctors of the Church ſeemed to deliver not only divers but contrary things*, *i. e.* they had no certain and conſtant *Tradition* about them. And when he comes to the point of *Confeſſion to God only*, he quotes for it, beſides *Scripture*, S. *Ambroſe*, and S. *Chryſoſtom*, and *Proſper*, and againſt it S. *Auguſtine* and *Leo*, and concludes himſelf for the latter; but ſaith not a word more to ſhew that the *conſtant Tradition* of the Church had been for this opinion.

Lom. *ſent. l.* 4. *diſt.* 17.

Grat. *de Pœnit. Diſt.* 1.

Gratian puts the ſame Queſtion, and for *Confeſſion to God alone* he quotes S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Auguſtine*, and *Proſper*, beſides *Scripture*, and argues largely for it after *c. Convertimini*, &c. Then he ſets down the Arguments on the other ſide from *c.* 38. and after *c.* 60. he ſums up the force of them, and again after *c.* 87. and when he hath ſaid

ſaid all on one ſide and on the other, he concludes after c. 89. *that he left all to the Readers Judgment; for both Opinions had wiſe and pious Defenders*; and produces that ſaying as out of *Theodore*'s *Penitential*; *that ſome think that we ought to confeſs only to God, as the* Greeks, *others that we ought to do it to the Prieſt too, as almoſt all the Church beſides*; but then he adds, *that Confeſſion to God purges away Sin, but that to the Prieſt ſhews how they are purged*, i. e. *by Contrition.* So the *Gloſs* interprets it. *Bellarmin* thinks that, *ut Græci*, was foiſted into the Canon, and I ſhall not diſpute againſt it, provided that which anſwers to it, *ut tota ferè ſancta Eccleſia*, be allowed to be ſo too, as the *Roman* Correctors do confeſs. Bell. *de pœnit.* l. 3. c. 5.

Boileau hath taken another courſe, for he ſaith, *this whole Diſtinction is without ground attributed to* Gratian; but how doth he prove it? From *Ant. Auguſtinus* his *Dialogue*, where a MS. is cited that this was not *Gratian*'s, but an elder Author's. And what is gotten by this? But the other anſwers, *it muſt be* Gratian's, *becauſe of the citation out of the Digeſts, and other Books of Civil Law then lately found.* If this will not do, he ſaith, Gratian *hath many Errours, as the Roman Correctors obſerve.* Yes truly do they; and about this Point ſeveral times; for the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent* have otherwiſe determined. But what is all this to the *Tradition* of the Church in *Gratian*'s time? *Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. p.* 388.

Innocent III. in the Council of *Lateran*, enjoyns ſtrictly the *Practice of Confeſſion once a year, under the Penalty of Excommunication, and of being deprived of Chriſtian Burial*; but there is not a Word of the Churches Tradition before, for the Ground of it. But finding ſeveral Opinions about it, and the *Waldenſes* then oppoſing it, he reſolves by his *Authority* to bind all Perſons to it. But after this the *Canoniſts* allowed no more than *Eccleſiaſti-*

cal Inſtitution for it; as is plain by the *Gloſs* on the *Canon Law, Diſt. 5. de Pœnit. Tit. In Pœnitentia*; but the *Roman Correctours* quote againſt it *Council. Trident. Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 5. *i. e.* a Council ſome 100 years after, muſt tell what the *Tradition* then was; but *the Gloſs* ſaith, *the Greeks had no ſuch Tradition, and therefore were not bound to Confeſſion.* So that we have no evidence for any *Catholick Tradition* in this matter, before the *Lateran Council.*

2. But the *Council* of *Trent* hath gone beyond the *Council* of *Lateran*, and hath fixed the Divine Right of *Confeſſion* on *John* 20. *Whoſe ſins ye remit*, &c. and therefore I am now to ſhew, by the *Confeſſion* of their own Writers, that this hath not been the *Traditionary Senſe* of this Place.

Cajetan, not long before the *Council* firſt ſate, in his Notes on this place confeſſes, *that no Precept of Sacramental Confeſſion is contained in it.* But how ſhould it be of *Divine Right* in the ſenſe of the Council of *Trent*, if there be no Command for it? *Yes, by Conſequence, if they will obtain Remiſſion of Sins*; but this can by no means be inferred from hence, becauſe the Remiſſion of Sins by *Baptiſm* is implied in it; but none of them plead for particular *Confeſſion* before *Baptiſm*, in order to *Remiſſion*; and therefore not after, unleſs ſome Command of Chriſt made it more neceſſary after *Baptiſm* than before, *Vaſquez* ſaith, *that* Cajetan *means no more, than that it cannot be proved out of this place*; but *Catharinus* ſaith, *that neither there nor in any other place doth* Cajetan *allow, that Auricular Confeſſion can be proved out of Scripture.*

Vaſquez *ubi ſupr.* Catharin. *in* Cajet. *p.* 446.

Gabriel Biel confeſſes, *he cannot find ſufficient force to conclude the Neceſſity of Confeſſion from the Power of Abſolution here granted; becauſe it may be valid upon voluntary Confeſſion of the Party; and therefore he reſolves it into an unwritten Tradition.*

Biel *in* 4. *ſent. Diſt.* 17. *q.* 1. *a.* 1.

Guide

Guido Brianson takes great pains to prove it out of this place, but at last yields, *that Christ's instituting such a Power, doth not bind Persons to confess their Faults to them that have it. For the Power of retaining doth not imply that no sins are retained which are not retained by the Priest upon Confession; neither then doth the Power of Absolution imply that no sins are remitted but such as are confessed to a Priest.* And therefore he betakes himself as *Biel* doth, to *unwritten Tradition*; and so doth *Nicol. de Orbellis.* Brianson *q.* 8. *Doc.* 1. *f.* 138. De Orbellis *ad l.* 4. *Dist.* 17.

Jac. de Almain debates the matter at large; and he says only *that it is a probable Opinion, that this Confession is of divine Appointment*; but he yields, *that Christ's granting a Power of Absolution, doth not make it a duty to confess to a Priest*; and he saith, *it is a false proposition, that where a Power of judging is given, others are bound to submit to it; for all that follows is, that their Sentence is valid if they do submit.* Almain *in* 4. *Dist.* 17.

But the force of what the Council of *Trent* deduces from this place, lies wholly in this, as *Vasquez* observes, *that because Christ hath given Authority to absolve, and they cannot exercise that Authority without Confession, therefore Confession is hereby made necessary.* And he confesses, *that scarce any have deduced the Argument effectually* from this place. But he saith one thing very observable, *that if this place be extended to Remission of Sins in Baptism, then it can never prove the necessity of Sacramental Confession.* And *Greg. de Valentia* as plainly owns, *that the Fathers did understand it of Baptism*; he names S. *Cyprian*, and S. *Ambrose*; but *Natalis Alexander* allows S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* to have so understood it; and that *Jansenius* and *Ferus* followed him; but besides these S. *Augustin* interprets this place as S. *Cyprian* had done. For as S. *Cyprian* from hence infers *the Power of Baptizing* Vasquez *ib. dub.* 2. Greg. de Valent. *de Necessit. Confess. c.* 3. Nat. Alex. *de Sacr. Confess. p.* 22. Cyprian *ad Jub. Ep.* 73.

and granting Remiſſion of Sins in the Guides of the Church; ſo S. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *the Churches Charity by the Holy Ghoſt looſes the Sins of thoſe who are her Members, and retains the ſins of thoſe who are not.* And it may be obſerved, that whereas St. *Matthew* ſpeaks of the Power of *Baptizing* granted to the *Apoſtles*; S. *John* inſtead of that mentions this *Power* of remitting or retaining *Sins*, and S. *Mark* and S. *Luke* ſpeak of *Baptiſm*; to which the one joins *Salvation*; and the other *Remiſſion of Sins.* And therefore this ſeems to be meant by our Saviour in the Words of S. *John*; and thus S. *Peter* exerciſed this *Power of looſing* on the *converted Jews*, Act. 2. 38. and his *Power* of *binding* on *Simon Magus*, Act. 8. 21.

Aug. *in* Joh. *Tr.* 121.

S. Mark. 16. 16. S. Luke 24. 47.

Peter Lombard carries S. *Auguſtin's* meaning farther, to the Power of Prieſts over the Sins of the Members of the Church; but then he limits this Power, and makes it no more than *declarative*; as I have obſerved already; and for this he quotes a notable paſſage of S. *Jerom*, who ſaith, that *Men are apt to aſſume too much to themſelves under pretence of this Power of the Keys, whereas God regards not the Sentence of the Prieſts but the Life of the Penitents.*

Pet. Lomb. *l.* 4. *Diſt.* 18.

Hieron. *in* Matth. c. 16.

But *Natalis Alexander* thinks *there is no binding Power with reſpect to Baptiſm*; Was there not as to *Simon Magus*? And as long as every year the Church judged of the *Competency* of Perſons for it? When Chriſt ſpake theſe words the Church was wholly to be formed, and it was a great Power lodged with the *Apoſtles* and their *Succeſſors* to admit into the Church, or to exclude from it, not as private Perſons, but by Authority from Chriſt himſelf. *But then this Power is vain and idle in a conſtituted Church.* By no means; they have ſtill a *Power* of caſting out and taking in again; and of impoſing ſuch Acts on Offenders, as may give ſatisfaction to the Church, whoſe Honour

Honour ſuffers, and whoſe Diſcipline is broken. But the queſtion is, Whether by Chriſt's appointment under the Goſpel no known mortal ſin can be pardon'd to *baptized Perſons* without *Confeſſion* of it to a Prieſt? And whether theſe words of our Saviour do imply it?

Scotus is by no means ſatisfied with mens Reaſoning out of this place, *that becauſe Chriſt hath given ſuch a Power, therefore it is mens duty to confeſs their ſins*; For, ſaith he, *this only implies the uſefulneſs and efficacy of this Power if it be made uſe of*; as in *Confirmation, none think themſelves damned if they do not uſe it, though it be very uſeful*; and therefore he goes another way to work, *viz. by joyning this precept and that of loving God and our ſelves together with it.* But how doth this prove that a man ought to take this particular way? Truly, *Scotus* here ſhews his Subtilty. *Suppoſe there be another way that is harder, and this be found more eaſie, he thinks a man is bound to take the ſhorteſt and eaſieſt way*, viz. *by Confeſſion and Abſolution.* Scot. *in l.* 4. *Diſt.* 17. *q. unica.*

But for all this his heart did miſgive him, and he could not but ſee, that this proved nothing, unleſs this way of *Confeſſion* were firſt proved to be a ſecure way. And therefore he puts the Caſe, *that if it be not proved by theſe Words, it may be by* S. James. *Confeſs your faults one to another. No*, ſaith he, *this will not do*; for which he gives this Reaſon, *that it holds no more for confeſſion to a Prieſt than to any other*; therefore, after all, he is willing to reſolve it into ſome *unwritten Tradition*, ſince there was no convincing evidence for it either in this or any other place of *Scripture.* Which ſhew'd they ran to Tradition, when they had nothing elſe to ſay.

Bonaventure denies that *Chriſt himſelf appointed the Confeſſion of ſins*; for which he gives this reaſon, *leſt it ſhould prove an occaſion of ſinning; ne ex verbis Domini daretur* Bonav. *in* 4. *Diſt.* 17. *q.* 3.

tur aliquibus recidivandi occaſio; but afterwards he thinks *the Apoſtles appointed it, and S.* James *publiſhed it*; which *Scotus* utterly denies. But to the place of S *John*, *Bonaventure* ſaith *it was not enough to have it implied in the Prieſt's Power, becauſe it being a harder duty than Abſolution, it requir'd a more particular Command.* Which was but reaſonably ſaid; eſpecially when *Bellarmin* after others, urges, *that it is one of the moſt grievous and burthenſome Precepts*; but his Inference from it is very mean, *that therefore it muſt have a divine Command to inforce it on the People*; but *Bonaventure*'s Argument is much ſtronger, that it ought then to have been clearly expreſſed. But as to the Peoples yielding to it, other accounts are to be given of that afterwards.

Bell. *de Pœn. l.* 2. *c.* 12.

Alex. *Sum.* 3. *p. q.* 18. *num.* 3. *art.* 2.

Alexander Hales obſerves, *that if Chriſt had intended a command of Confeſſion*, John 20. *it would have been expreſſed to thoſe who are to confeſs, and not to thoſe who are to abſolve*; *as he did to thoſe who were to be baptized*, John 3. Except a man be born of water, &c. *ſo Chriſt would have ſaid, except a man confeſs his ſins*, &c. *and he gave the ſame Reaſons why Chriſt did not himſelf inſtitute it, which* Bonaventure *doth*, who uſed his very words.

And now who could have imagined that the Council of *Trent* would have attempted to have made men believe *that it was the ſenſe of the Univerſal Church that Chriſt inſtituted Confeſſion in* John 20? when ſo many great *Divines* even of the *Church* of *Rome* ſo expreſly denied it; as I have made appear from themſelves.

But now to give an account by what *ſteps* and *degrees* and on what *occaſions* this *Auricular Confeſſion* came into the Church, theſe things are to be conſidered.

1. In

1. In the firſt Ages, *publick, ſcandalous Offenders* after *Baptiſm*, were by the *Diſcipline* of the Church brought to *publick Penance*; which was called *Exomologeſis*; which originally ſignifies *Confeſſion*. And by this, *Bellarmin* ſaith *the Ancients underſtood either Confeſſion alone, or joyned with the other parts of Penance*; but *Albaſpineus* ſhews, *that it was either taken for the whole courſe of publick Penance, or for the laſt and ſolemn act of it, when the Biſhop led the Penitents from the entrance of the Church up to the Body of the Congregation, where they expreſſed their abhorrence of their faults in the moſt penitent manner, by their Actions as well as by Words.* So that this was a real and publick *Declaration* of their ſorrow for their ſins, and not a *Verbal* or *Auricular Confeſſion* of them. The ſame is owned by *La Cerda*. But *Boileau* pretends *that it had not this ſenſe till after the Novatian Hereſie and the Death of* Irenæus; *and that before that time it ſignified Confeſſion according to the ſenſe of the Word in Scripture.* This ſeems very ſtrange, when *Baronius* himſelf confeſſes, *that* Tertullian *uſes it for that part of Penance which is called Satisfaction*; and *Bellarmin* grants it is ſo uſed both by *Tertullian* and *Irenæus*; when he ſaith *the Woman ſeduced by* Marcus, *afterwards ſpent her days in Exmologeſi.* What! in continual *Confeſſion* of her ſin? No, but in *Penitential Acts* for it; and ſo *Petavius* underſtands it, both in *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*; and he ſaith, *it did not conſiſt onely or principally in Words but in Actions*, *i. e.* it was nothing of kin to *Auricular Confeſſion*, which is a part of *Penance* diſtinct from *ſatisfaction*. And to make theſe the ſame, were to confound the different parts of the *Sacrament* of *Penance*, as the Council of *Trent* doth diſtinguiſh them.

Bell. *de Pœn. l.* 3. *c.* 6.

Albaſp. *Obſ. l.* 2. *c.* 26.

La Cerda. *Adverſ. Sacr. c.* 142. *p.* 2.

Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. c. 4. *p.* 72.

Baron. *ad A. D.* 56.

Iren. *l.* 1. *c.* 9.

Petav. *Not. ad* Epiphan. *p.* 71.

De la Penit. publique, l. 2. *ch.* 13. *n.* 9.

But

But beſides this, there were ſeveral other *Circumſtances*, which do make an apparent difference between theſe *Penitential Acts* and the modern notion of *Confeſſion*.

Rigalt. *not. in.* Tert. *de Pœn.*

1. The *Reaſon* of them was different. For, as *Rigaltius* obſerves, *the penitential Rigour was taken up after great Numbers were admitted into the Church*; and a great diſhonour was brought upon Chriſtianity by the looſeneſs or inconſtancy of thoſe who profeſſed it. There were ſuch in *S. Paul*'s time in the Churches of *Corinth*, and elſewhere; but although he gives Rules about ſuch, yet he mentions no other than *avoiding* or *excommunicating the guilty Perſons*, and upon due Sorrow and Repentance receiving them in again; but he impoſes no neceſſity of *Publick* or *Private Confeſſion* in order to *Remiſſion*; much leſs of every kind of mortal ſin, though it be but the breach of the tenth Commandment, as the *Council* of *Trent* doth; yet this had been neceſſary in caſe he had thought, as that declares, *that God will not forgive upon other terms*. And ſo much the rather, becauſe the *Evangeliſts* had ſaid nothing of it; and now Churches began to fill, it was abſolutely neceſſary for him to have declared it, if it were a neceſſary condition of Pardon for ſins after Baptiſm. But although the *Apoſtles* had given no Rules about it, yet the *Chriſtian Churches* ſuffering ſo extremely by the Reproaches caſt upon them, they reſolved, as far as it was poſſible, to take care to prevent any *ſcandalous Offences* among them. To this end, the actions of all Perſons who profeſſed themſelves Chriſtians were narrowly watched; and their faults, eſpecially ſuch as were *ſcandalous*, complained of; and then if they confeſſed them, or they were convicted of them, a ſevere and rigorous Diſcipline was to be undergone by them before they were reſtored to Communion; that

that their Enemies might ſee how far the Chriſtians were from incouraging ſuch *enormities* as they were accuſed of. They were charged with *Thyeſtean Suppers* and *promiſcuous mixtures*; whereas, any Perſons among them who were guilty of *Homicide* or *Adultery* were diſcharged their ſociety, and for a great while not admitted upon any terms; and afterwards, upon very rigorous and ſevere terms. And beſides theſe, to preſerve the purity of their Religion in times of Perſecution, they allowed no *Compliance* with the *Gentile Idolatry*; and any tendency to this, was looked upon as a degree of Apoſtaſie, and cenſured accordingly. And about theſe three ſorts of ſins the ſeverity of the Primitive Diſcipline was chiefly exerciſed; which ſhews, that it proceeded upon quite different grounds from thoſe of the Council of *Trent* about *Auricular Confeſſion*.

2. The *method* of *proceeding* was very different; for here was no *toties quoties* allow'd; that men may ſin, and confeſs, and be abſolved; and then ſin the ſame ſin again, and confeſs again, and receive Abſolution in the ſame manner. The *Primitive Church* knew nothing of this way of dealing with Sinners upon *Confeſſion*. If they were admitted *once* to it that was all. So *Pamelius* himſelf grants, and produces ſeveral Teſtimonies of *Fathers* for it; and ſo doth *Albaſpineus* and *Petavius*. Dare any ſay this is the ſenſe of the Church of *Rome* about *Confeſſion*, that a man cannot be received a ſecond time to *Confeſs* and be abſolved from the ſame ſin? How then can they pretend any *ſimilitude* between their *Confeſſion* and the ancient *Exomologeſis*? Beſides, none ever received *Abſolution* from the ancient Church till full *ſatisfaction* performed. But in the Church of *Rome*, *Abſolution* is given before *Satisfaction*; and although ſome

Pamel. *not.* 1. *in* Tert. *de. Pœnit.* Albaſp. *Obſ.* l. 2. c. 5. Petav. *ad* Epiph. p. 236. *Append. ad* Epiph. c. 3. p. 91.

have complained of this, as a great abuſe; yet they have been ſharply anſwer'd, *that it is to call in queſtion the Conduct of the Church for five hundred years; and they may as well queſtion many other things, which depend upon the Authority of the Preſent Church.*

3. The *Obligation* to Confeſſion is very different from what it was in the ancient *Exomologeſis*. Now by the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, a perſon looks on himſelf as bound in Conſcience to confeſs *every Mortal ſin*; but in the *Ancient Church* none can imagine that perſons were bound to undergo the *Exomologeſis* for every mortal ſin, there being no *Penitential Canons* which did ever require it; but they had reſpect to ſome particular ſins, and the *Penance* was proportion'd to them.

We ought to take notice of two things with reſpect to the *Diſcipline* of the *Ancient Church*, which will ſhew the different notion it had of theſe things from what is now current in the Church of *Rome*.

1. That it did not exclude thoſe from all hopes of *Salvation* whom it excluded from *Penance*; as may be ſeen in the *Illiberitan Council*, where many are wholly ſhut out from the *Church*, whom we cannot think they thought uncapable of Salvation. From whence it follows, that they did not look on *Confeſſion* and *Abſolution* as a neceſſary condition of Salvation; but now in the Church of *Rome* they allow Confeſſion to all, becauſe they think they cannot otherwiſe be in a ſtate of Salvation in an ordinary way. But in the *Ancient Church* they could not look on the *deſire* of *Confeſſion* as neceſſary, for to what purpoſe ſhould they make that neceſſary when they denyed the thing? But in the Church of *Rome*, they make the *deſire* neceſſary, becauſe they hold the thing it ſelf to be ſo, if there be means to have it.

Conc. Illiber. *c.* 1, 2, 3, *&c.*

2. That

2. That the *Penitential Canons* never extended in the *Primitive Church* to all thoſe ſins which the *Church* of *Rome* now accounts *Mortal*, and therefore neceſſary to be confeſſed. The Council of *Trent* ſaith expreſly, they muſt confeſs *omnia & ſingula peccata mortalia—etiam occulta*—and an *Anathema* is denounced againſt him that denies it to be neceſſary to Remiſſion of them. Now if we conſider their notion of *mortal ſins*, we ſhall eaſily diſcern the vaſt difference between the Obligation to Confeſſion by the Council of *Trent*, and by the old *Penitential Canons*. For *mortal* ſins are not only all Voluntary Acts committed againſt the known Laws of God, but againſt the Laws of the Church; and even venial ſins may become mortal by the Diſpoſition of the Perſon, and by other circumſtances, which the Caſuiſts ſet down at large; now the Council of *Trent* doth expreſly oblige men, not only to relate the Acts themſelves, but *all Circumſtances which change the kind of Sin.* And this is a racking the Conſciences of Men far beyond whatever we find in the old *Penitential Canons*; for, *Petavius* confeſſes *that many ſins now accounted mortal, had no Penance appointed for them by the old Canons*; and therefore I need not take any pains to prove it: If any one hath a mind to be ſatisfied, he may ſee it in *Gregory Nyſſen's Canonical Epiſtle*, where he owns that ſeveral of thoſe ſins, for which the *Scripture* excludes from the Kingdom of Heaven, have no *Canonical Penance* preſcribed them by *the ancient Canons of the Church.* Which ſhews a mighty difference from the Rule of the *Council* of *Trent.*

De Pœnit. can. 7.

Petav. *not. ad* Epiph. *p.* 238.

Greg. Nyſſ. *Epiſt. ad* Let. *c.* 4, 5.

The moſt plauſible place in Antiquity brought for all *mortal ſin*, is that of S. *Cyprian*, where he ſaith, *that ſome confeſſed their very thoughts, though they had not proceed-*

Cypr. *de lapſis*, *n.* 23.

ed to actual ſin. It is true, that he doth ſpeak of ſome ſuch; but was it for *ſins* of *thought* againſt the *tenth Command*? No; but it is very plain, that he ſpeaks of that ſin which was thought to imply a renouncing Chriſtianity, and S. *Cyprian* elſewhere calls *ſummum delictum*, and *the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*; *viz.* conſenting to any *Act* of *gentile Idolatry*; and yet Saint *Cyprian* had much ado to perſwade thoſe who were actually guilty to ſubmit to due Penance for it; but they obtained *Tickets* from the *Confeſſors*, and were admitted to communion without undergoing the Diſcipline of the Church, the conſequence whereof would be, that the Diſcipline would be loſt, and the Church over-run with Apoſtates; this makes S. *Cyprian* plead hard againſt ſuch practices, and among other arguments he uſes this of the great tenderneſs of ſome, who becauſe they had entertained ſuch thoughts of doing as others did, for their own ſafety, they offered to unburthen their Conſciences before them, and deſired remedy for ſmall Wounds; how much more ought they to confeſs their faults whoſe wounds are greater? This is the whole force of his reaſoning; where the Thought and Act relate to the ſame ſin; and that ſaid to be no leſs than *denying Chriſt, and ſinning againſt the Holy Ghoſt.* But there is no parity in the caſe of other ſins; which even S. *Cyprian* calls *minora delicta*, being againſt men immediately; and there is no intimation in him that ever the thoughts of thoſe ſins were diſcovered, or that Perſons were under any obligation by the Rules of the Church to do it.

Cypr. *Ep.* 10.

Cypr. *Ep.* 12.

2. *Private Offenders* were ſometimes adviſed in thoſe firſt Ages for the eaſe of their *Conſciences* to make *Confeſſion*

feſſion of their ſins; of which we ſee an inſtance as to the Practice in one Caſe in S. *Cyprian's* time. And *Tertullian* compares ſuch Perſons who avoid it, to thoſe who have ſuch ſecret Ulcers that they chuſe *rather to periſh than to diſcover them.* Now in Caſes of this nature he adviſes to *Confeſſion and publick penitential Acts*, that ſo they may in the Judgment of the Church have the ſecret Wounds of their Conſciences healed. And this is that which *Origen* doth adviſe to in ſuch Caſes, *to ſeek out a wiſe ſpiritual Phyſician, and to make known his inward diſtemper to him, and to follow his advice and direction, as to the Method of Cure.* Now this we never oppoſe; but the only Queſtion is, whether it be neceſſary for all Perſons, and for every Mortal Sin, to make *Confeſſion* of it to the *Prieſt*, that it may be forgiven; and *Origen* never once ſuppoſes this; for he mentions ſeveral other ways for the *Remiſſion of Sins* after *Baptiſm*, by *Martyrdom*, by *Alms*, by *forgiving and converting others*, by *great Love to God*, and in the laſt place he brings in this *of a Laborious Penance and Confeſſion.* Either the former ways are ſufficient without this, or not; if they are, then this is not neceſſary to the Remiſſion of all mortal Sins; if not, to what purpoſe doth he mention ſo many ways, when this one is ſufficient without them, and all thoſe are inſufficient without this? For *Boileau* confeſſes, *that no mortal ſins according to them can be remitted, where there is not at leaſt the deſire of this.* But *Origen* ſhews the different ways of obtaining Remiſſion, or elſe he doth not anſwer the difficulty; which was, *that the Jews had ſeveral ſorts of Sacrifices for the Expiation of Sins, to which we have none anſwerable under the Goſpel,* Yes, ſaith *Origen*, *Baptiſm anſwers to one ſort, Martyrdom to another, Alms to a third*, &c. and laſt of all, *Penance*

Orig. *in* Levit. *Hom.* 2. *in* Pſal. 37. *Hom.* 2. *in* Luc. *Hom.* 17.

Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. c. 5. *n.* 8.

to

to the Offering baked in the Frying Pan. From whence it is plain, that he looked on this as one particular way proper to ſome Caſes, and not as a general Method for the Remiſſion of all mortal Sins. But he urges *that* Origen *quotes Scripture for the Confeſſion of Sins, as neceſſary,* Hom. 2. *in* Pſal. 37. But what *Scripture?* Even the Words of the *Pſalmiſt, I will confeſs my Iniquity.* And was *Confeſſion* to a Prieſt neceſſary under the Law? How then can thoſe words prove it neceſſary under the Goſpel? Although therefore *Origen* might think it very convenient in ſome caſes for *Penitents* to unload their Conſciences by Confeſſion to a *Spiritual Phyſician,* yet we find no proof of any neceſſity of it, as to all mortal Sins. It is confeſſed, that publick Faults, either confeſſed or proved, had publick *Penance* appointed for them by the *Penitential Canons*; but *Boileau*, after *Arnauld*, pleads, *that even ſecret Sins being mortal, were not thought remiſſible by the Keys of the Church, without publick Penance.* But this can never be proved to have been the Doctrine of the *Ancient Church*, and it is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe; for then, all Perſons muſt have undergone publick Penance who had any mortal Sin, and it muſt have been frequently born by the ſame Perſons, both which are inconſiſtent with the *Ancient Diſcipline.* But they ſaw there was no other way to maintain the *Neceſſity* of *Confeſſion*, but by this. For they could find none but *publick Penance*, and that by the *Penitential Canons* was preſcribed only for ſome particular ſcandalous Sins; and therefore they fanſied, that Perſons who committed other faults, were bound to confeſs them privately, and to undergo publick Penance for them. I do not deny, but ſome *great Penitents*, for ſecret Faults, would of their own accord ſubmit to the publick Diſcipline; but this was a voluntary Act in them, that

that by this means they might aſſure themſelves the more of the ſincerity of their own Repentance; and it being looked on as an Act of *Humility* and *Piety*, it made it go down the better with *Voluntary Penitents*.

3. For the ſake of ſuch *Voluntary Penitents* in great Churches, whoſe Caſes required *particular and private Examination and Direction*, there was a *Penitentiary* appointed, whoſe *Office* it was to receive their *Confeſſions*, and to direct and order the Method of their *Penance*. Of this we have a famous Inſtance in the Church of *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Nectarius*, about which ſo much pains hath been taken for different purpoſes. That which ſeems moſt probable to me, is, that the *Penitentiary* was appointed to examine and judge of ſuch *Penitential Cauſes* which were brought before him, (not being notorious,) and to give ſentence according to the Canons; but eſpecially of *Voluntary Confeſſions* of Perſons, whoſe Conſciences were oppreſſed with the Guilt of Secret Sins; and to thoſe he was to appoint *Penance* without revealing their Faults. Where the Facts were *notorious* and *ſcandalous*, I ſuppoſe the ancient *Diſcipline* of the *Church* (part whereof is to be ſeen in the *Canonical Epiſtles*) to have ſtill continued at *Conſtantinople*, as well as in other Churches. But there were many private miſcarriages, wherein great Prudence and Judgment was required, both to determine the *Penance*, and to manage it ſo, that it did not break out into an open Scandal. And for Caſes of this Nature the *Penitentiary* was appointed; to whom all Perſons might reſort in private caſes, and open their Conſciences to him, and take his Directions how to perform their *Penitential Acts*. So it was with that Perſon of Quality at *Conſtantinople*, who gave occaſion to the abo-

Pandect. Canon. Vol. 2.

aboliſhing the *Office* of *Penitentiary*, both there, and in all the *Eaſtern Churches*. She firſt went to the *Penitentiary*, as a *voluntary Penitent*, and confeſſed her Faults to him, and took his directions; and while ſhe was performing her Penance in the Church, the Fact was committed with the Deacon, which ſhe afterwards confeſſed to the *Penitentiary*. Who being enraged at the Deacon, in probability through his deſire to have him puniſhed, the Fact came to be diſcovered, and the People to be highly offended: And it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the *Penitentiary* put her upon a *publick Confeſſion* of her ſecret fault; but that it came out by his means; and therefore *Nectarius* thought fit no longer to put ſuch a Truſt into any Man's hand, which through his diſcovery might redound to the Diſhonour of the Church, as that did.

What the effect was of aboliſhing this Office, is the great Queſtion, whether the taking away *publick* or *private Confeſſion*. If the Hiſtorians may be believed, it was the *Neceſſity of making any Confeſſion at all in ſecret*; for the Right of receiving ſuch Confeſſions, was devolved upon the *Penitentiary*; therefore when his Office was put down, where the Caſe was not notorious, every one *muſt be left to his own Conſcience*; and that both *Socrates* and *Sozomen* affirm was the conſequence of it. If only *publick Confeſſion* was taken away, as ſome imagine, a *ſecret Confeſſion* was ſtill continued, how was it poſſible for the *Hiſtorians* to miſtake the matter ſo groſly, by making that the conſequence of it? For, *is every Man left to his own Conſcience*, where he is bound to go to *Confeſſion* before he partakes of the *Euchariſt*? And why ſhould publick *Penance* be taken away on this occaſion, where there ſeems to have been none; for that Perſon underwent

Socr. *l.* 5. *c.* 19. Soz. *l.* 7. *c.* 16.

went to *publick Penance* upon her former *Confeſſion*, for then her *Penance* would not have been *done in the Church*, but out of it, among the *Penitents*. But as the former was voluntary, ſo was the latter too; for here was no Accuſer but her ſelf; and for what Reaſon ſhould publick and ſolemn Penance for notorious Crimes, be taken away for the ſake of the diſcovery of a *Secret Confeſſion*? Whether the puniſhment of the Deacon were the Occaſion of its coming out, or whatever it was, it ſeems evident to me, that ſhe was not obliged to any publick Confeſſion; becauſe *Sozomen* ſaith, *the Penitentiary was choſen for his Gravity, Silence and Wiſdom*; but what *Silence* was there, if the *Confeſſions* were to be made *publick*. And on the other ſide, it is impoſſible to conceive, that if all Perſons were then obliged to confeſs all mortal Sins after *Baptiſm*, that one *Penitentiary* ſhould be ſufficient in ſo vaſt a City as that of *Conſtantinople* was. Therefore I think it moſt probable, that the caſe of *notorious and ſcandalous Offenders* ſtood as it did, and ſo continued in S. *Chryſoſtom*'s time; but this Office of *Penitentiary* relating to *voluntary* and *ſecret Offenders* was taken away; becauſe a greater *Scandal* came to the Church by the diſcovery, when ſuch a publick Diſgrace made the Act become notorious. And ſo this Act of *Nectarius* in taking away the *Penitentiary*'s Office, and the *Approbation* of it by other Churches following the Example, evidently proves, that they did not look on *Confeſſion* of *ſecret Sins*, as neceſſary to the *Remiſſion* of them.

4. As the taking away the *Penitentiary*'s Office ſhewed the Senſe of the *Church* at that time againſt the *Neceſſity of Confeſſion* in order to Pardon, ſo it did likewiſe in order to the partaking of the Euchariſt. For *Socrates*

Socr. *l.* 5. *c.* 19. ſaith, *that* Eudæmon *gave that Counſel to* Nectarius, *that he ſhould remove the Penitentiary, and give every one leave to paſs Judgment on himſelf in his own Conſcience, and ſo to partake of the Myſteries.* The ſame is affirmed by *Sozomen.* Which reſpects not the *publick Diſcipline* about *Notorious Offenders*, but the private Applications made by ſcrupulous Perſons and ſecret *Offenders* to the *Penitentiary* in order to a right preparation for the Euchariſt. And it is very probable, that it was then believed by many, that they could not be duly fitted for that *Sacrament*, unleſs they had firſt unburthened their *Conſciences* by a *voluntary Confeſſion* to the *Penitentiary*, and followed his Directions. But this *Office* being taken away, the Queſtion now is, whether it were thought neceſſary to *confeſs privately* to any other? The Council of *Trent* declares, *that Sacramental Confeſſion is neceſſary to a worthy partaking of the Euchariſt, to every one that is conſcious to himſelf of any mortal ſin; and whoſoever holds the contrary is declared excommunicate* ipſo facto. But theſe Hiſtorians plainly deny it, and they are juſtified by S. *Chryſoſtom*, who ſpeaks to the very Caſe; not about *Catechumens*, but ſuch as would fit themſelves for the *Holy Euchariſt.* And he ſeveral times declares, that a man needs not reveal his ſins to any but *to God alone*, in order to it. Nothing can be more Emphatical than what he ſaith to that purpoſe.

Soz. *l.* 7. *c.* 16.

Concil. Trid. *Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 7. *Can.* 11.

Διὰ τοῦτο φησιν ὁ Παῦλος. Ἕκαστος δὲ δοκιμαζέτω ἑαυτὸν καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθίετω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω· οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ἕλκος οὐκ εἰς κοινὸν Θέατρον ἤγαγε τὴν κατηγορίαν· οὐ περιέστησε μάρτυρας τῶν πλημμελημάτων· ἔνδον ἐν τῷ συνειδότι μηδενὸς παρόντος, πλὴν τοῦ τὰ πάντα ὁρῶντος Θεοῦ, ποιοῦ τὴν κρίσιν, καὶ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων τὴν ἐξε-

For this Cauſe S. *Paul* ſaith, *Let a man examin himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup; he doth not lay open the ſecret Ulcer; he doth not bring the Accuſation into a Theatre; he appoints no Witneſſes of thy Tranſgreſſions; paſs judgment within thine own Conſcience, there examin thy faults, and call thy ſelf*

to

to an account for the sins of thy Life, where none but God is present, who sees all things; amend thy faults, and so with a pure Conscience draw near to the holy Table, and partake of the Sacrifice there offered.

τασιν. ᾧ πάντα τὸν βίον ἀναλογίζῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦ τὸ κριτήριον ἄγε τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, διόρθου τὰ πλημμελήματα, ᾧ ὕτω μὴ καθαροῦ τοῦ συνειδότος τὴν ἱερᾶς ἁπτόμενος τραπέζης, ᾧ τῆς ἁγίας μετέχε θυσίας. S. Chrys. To. 6. p. 837. Hom. 8. de Pœnit. Hom. 28. in 1 ad Corinth.

But lest this should be thought one of those sudden eloquent heats which *Petavius* saith, *are hardly capable of good sense, if too strictly examined*; we find him very cooly delivering the same Doctrine in his Exposition of those words of S. *Paul*. Than which nothing can be more inconsistent with the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the Church of *Rome*, which makes *Confession* of our *Sins* to a Priest a necessary Preparation for the *Eucharist*. *Catharinus* saith, *that if the Church had not limited the time, yet every Person would be bound to confess to a Priest, as often as he communicated. And although he knew no mortal sin by himself, yet he would deserve the severest Censure for not confessing, because he took upon himself to be his own Judge.* Can any thing be more contrary to S. *Chrysostom* than this? *Boileau* confesses, *that* S. Chrysostom *doth not here refer at all to Confession to a Priest*; then it follows, that he thought it not necessary to right participation of the Holy Eucharist. Here he speaks not of *daily Examination* of *Conscience by the faithful*; but of the solemn Judgment of *Conscience* by way of due Preparation; and so justifies the Fact of *Nectarius* in taking away the *Penitentiaries* Office. But we are not to suppose so great and so zealous a Man would have done it against his Conscience, as he must, if he still thought *Confession to a Priest necessary*; and he doth not say, *they need not go now to the Penitentiary*, but that they need not disclose their sins to any. *Not to a multitude, or in a theatrical manner*, as some expound

Petav. *Not. ad* Epiphan. *p.* 244.

Cathar. c. Cajetan. p. 453. 451.

Hist. Confess. Auric. p. 201.

pound it; but *to none but God*, which excludes the knowledge of a ſingle Prieſt, as well as of a great number. I need not inſiſt on the other places in S. *Chryſoſtom* to that purpoſe, ſince theſe are ſufficient for my deſign.

Caſſian. *Collat.* 20. c. 8.

Caſſian was a Diſciple of S. *Chryſoſtom*, and he ſuppoſes *Confeſſion to God alone to be ſufficient for Remiſſion of Sin, where mere modeſty hinders men from confeſſing to men.* *Boileau* anſwers *that he doth not ſpeak of Sacramental Confeſſion made to Prieſts; but of an Aſcetick Confeſſion among the Monks.* But he ſpeaks of a Confeſſion to God as ſufficient for Remiſſion of Sins, and therefore muſt exclude the *Neceſſity* of any other.

Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. c. 18. p. 286.

5. After the taking away *the Penitentiary's Office*, the *Publick Diſcipline* of the Church, as to *open* and *ſcandalous Offenders* continued for ſome time in the *Eaſtern* as well as the *Weſtern Churches*. No one ſpeaks more fully to this than S. *Chryſoſtom*; which makes me wonder at thoſe who ſay the *publick Penance* was taken away by *Nectarius*, for in his 82. *Homily* on S. *Matthew*, towards the Concluſion he inſiſts very much upon it; and not only charges the People not to come with their ſins upon them; but he ſpeaks to thoſe who miniſtred, *to deny the Euchariſt to open Offenders.* And he ſaith, *it would be charged as a great Fault upon them, if they knew ſuch and permitted them to communicate. But how ſhall we know them? I ſpeak not*, ſaith he, *of thoſe who are not, but of thoſe who are known; and if any ſuch did thruſt themſelves in, he bid them not be afraid to deny them; and if they durſt not*, he tells them, *they ſhould bring them to him, and he would rather loſe his life than give that Sacrament to ſuch unworthy receivers.* But ſtill he ſaith he ſpeaks of *open and notorious Offenders.* Which ſhews

ſhews plainly, that even S. *Chryſoſtom* never thought the *publick Diſcipline* was changed; ſince he declares ſo much Reſolution to maintain it. And this could not be ſpoken by him while he was a *Presbyter* at *Antioch*, but after he came to the See of *Conſtantinople*. There was no doubt ſome alteration as to the *Penitents*, after the taking away the *Penitentiary*; but it was no more than his Office was concerned in. The old *Penitential Canons* remained ſtill in force and were executed; as *Occaſion* ſerved; as appears by the *Canons* in *Trullo* ſo long after S. *Chryſoſtom's* time which refer to them. If all the *publick Diſcipline* had been laid aſide ſo long before, to what purpoſe do thoſe *Biſhops* ſpeak of them, as if they were ſtill in force? See *Canon* 44, 46, 53, 54, 87. In the laſt *Canon* indeed *they leave it to thoſe who had the Power of binding and looſing to temper the ſeverity of the Canons as they ſhould judge convenient*; but doth it hence follow, that the ancient Diſcipline as to *publick Offenders* was deſtroy'd? S. *Chryſoſtom* himſelf ſeveral times mentions thoſe who were in the ſtate of *Penitents* and *the Prayer that was made for them*; to what purpoſe, in caſe the whole Order of *Penitents* was taken away? He likewiſe ſpeaks of the charge *for the Penitents to go out*. What a *mockery*, were this, if there were no *Publick Diſcipline* then left? And leſt it ſhould be ſaid, *that theſe things were ſaid by him at* Antioch, *before the fact of* Nectarius, I have ſhew'd already that the latter Homilies on S. *Matthew* were made by him at *Conſtantinople*; and in his *Liturgy* there uſed the diſmiſſion of the *Penitents* was continued.

S. Chryſ. *in* Matth. *Hom.* 71.

In 2 Ep. ad Cor. *Hom.* 18.

Hom. 3 *in Ep. ad* Epheſ.

6. While the *publick Diſcipline* was kept in the ſeveral Churches none were injoyned to undergo it, but *open and publick Offenders*. The Evidence being ſo clear in

in *Antiquity* for the *publick Penance* of those who were bound to give the Church *satisfaction* before they receiv'd *Absolution* from it; there was a necessity found by some learned Men of the *Roman Communion* to set up a new *Hypothesis*, viz. *that by the Ancient Rules of the Church all Persons conscious to themselves of secret sins were bound to undergo publick Penance for the Remission of their sins.* The occasion of the debate was this. Some in the Church of *Rome* held no more necessary in case of *mortal Sin* to prepare men for *Communion than Confession to a Priest and Absolution*; others saw the fatal Consequence of this, and therefore insisted on the *Necessity of Penance*; both Parties made their Appeal to the *Ancient Church*; and both were mistaken. For, on the one side, there was no such Doctrine then held that *Confession and Absolution* did sufficiently prepare Persons for the *Eucharist*; and on the other, there was no good Evidence that any were enjoyned *publick Penance* for secret faults. But in the Case of such sins, the Confession was left to God in Secret; and a true and hearty Contrition for them was thought the best as well as most necessary Preparation for the Eucharist.

Petav. *de la Penitence publique, l.* 5. *ch.* 10. *p.* 64.

Arn. *de freq. Communione, Part.* 2. *c.* 3. *p.* 205.

Petav. *l.* 2, *c.* 5. *n.* 3.

Monsr. *Arnauld* saw well enough that without his *Hypothesis*, it was impossible to prove the *Necessity* of *Confession* in the *Ancient Church*; for he yields that the Church did not use the *Power* of the *Keys* but *in Publick*. On the the other hand, *Petavius* urges, *that on the same Ground that they would reduce, as they pretended, the Ancient Discipline they must make many other alterations in the Church, and so justifie the Reformers.* But Monsr. *Arnauld* was defective in his Proofs, as *Petavius* at large shews; not when he proves *that the Penance was publick*; but that all Persons under mortal sins were bound to undergo it. For *Petavius* makes it appear, that

that all ſuch as are accounted *mortal ſins* in the modern ſenſe, were not then thought neceſſary to be expiated by *publick Penance*; but only ſuch as were *notorious* and *ſcandalous*, and he at large anſwers all Monſr. *Arnauld*'s Arguments. *l.* 6. *c.* 2, *&c.* Notwithſtanding which *Morinus* took up Monſr. *Arnauld*'s Opinion, and without any colour charges it on *Theodore* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, *that he firſt in his Penitential appointed publick Penance to be onely for publick Offences.* But the learned Editor of the *Abſtract* of *Theodore*'s *Penitential*, hath fully vindicated him in this matter. Morin. *Com. de Pœnit. l.* 10. *c.* 17. Theod. *Vind. p.* 61, *&c.*

But after theſe, *Boileau* reſumes the Opinion of Monſr. *Arnauld*, and lays it for the Foundation of his Hiſtory of *Auricular Confeſſion.* But he grants, *that all the ſolemn and ceremonial Penance impoſed by the Penitential Canons did not extend to all kind of mortal ſins, but chiefly to Idolatry, Adultery and Homicide*; but this he inſiſts upon, *that ſome part of this publick Penance*, viz. *Excluſion from the Communion was inflicted on Perſons guilty of ſecret mortal ſins.* But this will by no means do his buſineſs; for he is to prove that *no ſecret mortal ſin could be forgiven without Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; and that all perſons were required by the ancient Church in caſe they were conſcious to themſelves of any ſuch ſins, to make them known, and to undergo *publick Penance* for them, before they could obtain *Remiſſion* of them. We do not deny that Perſons under Trouble of *Conſcience* for ſecret ſins, were from time to time adviſed to reſort to their Guides, to make known their *Caſes* to them, and to take their *Directions*; we do not deny that ſuch Perſons might be required by ſuch *Guides* to withdraw themſelves from joyning in the moſt ſolemn *Acts* of *publick Communion* till they had manifeſted the ſincerity of their *Hiſt. Confeſſ. Auric. c.* 2.

their Repentance, by *Faſting*, and *Prayers*, and other *penitential Acts*; we do not deny, that ſome of theſe Perſons might either by Advice or of their own Accord joyn themſelves with the *publick Penitents*, as is well known in the Caſe of *Fabiola* at *Rome* ſo much magnified by S. *Jerom*; but this is the thing we deſire to ſee proved, that no ſin whatſoever of a *mortal nature* (as it is defined in the Church of *Rome*) was then thought capable of *Remiſſion* by the *penitential Acts* of the Party, (eſpecially by true *Contrition*) without *Confeſſion* to a *Prieſt* and *Abſolution* from him. And this is the true *ſtate* of the Caſe; and I can find nothing produced by him to this purpoſe which deſerves to be conſidered.

7. As the *publick Diſcipline* declined, Perſons were exhorted to make *private Confeſſion* of their ſins; if they could not be brought to *publick Penance*. Thence in the *Greek Church* came the *Penitentials* of *Johannes Jejunator* (who firſt took upon himſelf the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* in the time of *Mauritius* to the great Offence of the Biſhops of *Rome*) and of ſome others after him.

Joh. Morin. *Com de Pœn. l.* 6. *c.* 22, 23.

Morinus grants that there was a great alteration in the *Greek Church* about this matter; he thinks it began with the buſineſs of the *Penitentiary*, but after the publick Diſcipline was diſuſed, inſtead of that, he ſaith, *came up a ſecret Confeſſion and Penance*; which was left to the honeſty, and piety of the Penitent, and not required by any Canonical Authority among them; and ſo he ſaith it continued from the time of *Nectarius* to this day, as to the People. So that we have a plain Confeſſion from him, that there is no Rule in the *Greek Church* requiring this *ſecret Confeſſion* of Sins in order to the forgive-

c. 23. *n.* 1, 2.

neſs

neſs of them. But it is obſervable concerning the *modern Greeks*, that if Perſons do make *Confeſſion* among them, they think themſelves obliged to keep to the old *Penitential Canons*, and blame *Joh. Jejunator* for receding from them; for *Simeon* of *Theſſalonica* ſaith, *they had them from the Fathers, and the Fathers by Tradition down from the Apoſtles*. But although they are therein miſtaken, yet they ſhew how different their *Tradition* is from that of the *Roman Church*, which thinks it ſelf under no ſuch obligation, but allows *Abſolution* to be granted upon *Confeſſion*, and a right of Communion without *Penance* performed, for which there is no colour, as to any *ancient Tradition* either of the *Eaſtern* or *Weſtern Church*.

In the *Weſtern Church* we find the *publick Diſcipline* fallen to decay in the beginning of the *ninth Age*, and *Charles* the Great ſummoning *ſeveral Councils* for putting things into as good an Order as they would then bear. In the ſecond *Council* of *Cavaillon*, *A. D.* 813. we find a Complaint, *Can.* 25. *that the old Canonical Penance was generally diſuſed; and neither the ancient Order of Excommunicating or Abſolving was obſerved.* Which is a plain and ingenuous acknowledgment that they had gone off from the *ancient Tradition* of the Church; and therefore they pray the Emperor's Aſſiſtance, *that the publick Diſcipline might be reſtored for publick Offenders, and the ancient Canons be brought into uſe again.* From whence it follows, that at that time *notorious Offenders* eſcaped with *private Confeſſion* and *Penance*; and even that was done by halves, *can.* 32. and ſome thought it not neceſſary to do it at all, *can.* 33. And upon this Occaſion, they do not declare it neceſſary for the *Remiſſion of Sins* to confeſs even the moſt ſe-

cret mortal Sins to a Prieſt; but very fairly ſay, *that both are uſeful; for Confeſſion to God purgeth the Sin; and to the Prieſt, teaches men how their ſins may be purged. For God who is the Author and giver of Health, giveth it often by the Invisible Operation of his Power, and often by the means of Phyſicians.*

Juſt Confeſſ. Auric. c. 25. 3. *Boileau* yields, *that there were ſome then in the Roman Church, who denied Confeſſion to Men to be neceſſary,* but he ſaith, *they were Adverſaries and Rebels.* This had been a good Anſwer, if the Council had called them ſo; which it doth not, but on the contrary declares, *that God doth often forgive ſin immediately without the Prieſts Interpoſition,* or elſe the latter Clauſe ſignifies nothing. And the moſt it ſaith before, is, *that Confeſſion to a Prieſt is uſeful in the Church*; which is not the the thing diſputed by us, but the Neceſſity of it; and his Critical Obſervations of *Utrumque* ſignifie juſt nothing, unleſs he had proved that the Council had before ſaid that both were neceſſary,

c. 29. p. 387. which it doth not. He doth not deny, *that the Opinion of the Sufficiency of Confeſſion to God alone did continue in the Church to the time of the Council of* Lateran, *and that it gave Occaſion to the Canon, which enforced the Neceſſity of Confeſſion to a Prieſt*; but he adds, *that learned and pious Men may have falſe Opinions before the Judgment of the Church.* So that at laſt we find *Univerſal Tradition* is given up, and the Neceſſity of *Auricular Confeſſion* is reſolved into the Authority of the *Roman* Churches Definition, or rather, the *Pope's Declaration* of it, either with or without the Conſent of the *Lateran* Council. But he ſaith, *The Fathers did not ſpeak ſo exactly of the Trinity before the Council of* Nice; *nor the Greek Fathers of Grace and Predeſtination before S.* Auguſtin. If this be true, it is impoſſible to prove either of thoſe great Points merely by Tradition;

dition; for thoſe Fathers either delivered the ſenſe of the Church, or they did not; if they delivered the ſenſe of the Church, then either the ſenſe of the Church was doubtful, or they did not underſtand it; if the ſenſe of the Church were doubtful, then it is plain thoſe Doctrines could not be proved by Tradition; if the ſenſe of the Church were not doubtful, but the Fathers did not underſtand it, then how is it poſſible that the *Churches Tradition* ſhould be an *Infallible Guide*, when even the *Fathers* of the Church were miſtaken about it? But I have ſufficiently proved, that not only before, but even after the Council of *Lateran* there was no *Univerſal Tradition for the Neceſſity of Auricular Confeſſion.*

FINIS.

A CATALOGUE of some BOOKS Printed for Henry Mortlock, *at the* Phœnix in *S.*Paul's Church-Yard.

A Rational Account of the Grounds of Proteſtant Religion, being a Vindication of the Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*'s Relation of a Conference, *&c.* from the pretended Anſwer by *T. C.* Wherein the True Grounds of Faith are cleared, and the Falſe diſcovered; the Church of *England* vindicated from the Impu ation of Sciſm; and the moſt important particular Controverſie between us and thoſe of the Church of *Rome* throughly examined: By *Edward Stillingfleet*, D. D. and Dean of S. *Paul*'s, Folio. the Second Edition.

Origines Britanniccæ: Or the Antiquity of the *Britiſh Churches*; with a Preface concerning ſome pretended Antiquities relating to *Britain*, in vindication of the Biſhop of S. *Aſaph.* by *Edward Stillingfleet* D. D. Dean of S. *Paul*'s, Folio.

The Rule of Faith: Or an Anſwer to the Treatiſe of Mr. *J.S.* entituled, *Sure footing, &c.* by *John Tillotſon* D. D. to which is adjoyned, A Reply to Mr. *J.S.*'s third Appendix. *&c.* by *Edward Stillingfleet*. D. D.

A Letter to Mr. *G.* giving a true Account of a late Conference at the D. of P's.

A ſecond Letter to Mr. *G.* in anſwer to two Letters lately publiſhed concerning the Conference at the D. of P's.

Veteres Vindicati: In an Expoſtulary Letter to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*, upon his *Conſenſus Veterum*, &c. wherein the abſurdity of his Method, and the weakneſs of his Reaſons are ſhewn; His falſe Aſperſions upon the Church of *England* are wiped off, and her Faith concerning the Euchariſt proved to be that of the primitive Church: Together with Animadverſions on Dean *Boileau*'s French tranſlation of, and Remarks upon *Bertram*.

An Anſwer to the Compiler of *Nubes Teſtium*: Wherein is ſhewn, That Antiquity (in relation to the Points in Controverſie ſet down by him) did not for the firſt five hundred Years Believe, Teach and Practice as the Church of *Rome* doth at preſent Believe, Teach and Practice; together with a Vindication of *Veteres Vindicati* from the late weak and diſingenuous Attempts of the Author of Tranſubſtantiation Defended by the Author of the Anſwer to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*.

A Letter to Father *Lewis Sabran* Jeſuit, in anſwer to his Letter to a Peer of the Church of *England*; wherein the Poſtſcript to the Anſwer to the *Nubes Teſtium*, is Vindicated, and Father *Sabran*'s Miſtakes farther diſcovered.

A ſecond Letter to Father *Lewis Sabran* Jeſuit, in Anſwer to his Reply.

A Vindication of the Principles of the Author of the Anſwer to the Compiler of *Nubes Teſtium* in anſwer to a late pretended Letter from a Diſſenter to the Divines of the Church of *England*.

Scripture and Tradition Compared, in a Sermon preached at *Guild-Hall-chapel Nov.* 27. 1687. by *Edward Stillingfleet* D. D. Dean of S. *Paul*'s, the ſecond Edition.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature and Grounds of the Certainty of Faith, in Anſwer to *J. S.* his Catholick Letters. by *Edward Stillingfleet*, D. D. Dean of St. *Paul*'s.

An Hiſtorical Examination of the Authority of General Councils, ſhewing the falſe Dealing that hath been uſed in the publiſhing of them, and the Difference amongſt the Papiſts themſelves about their Number. The ſecond Edition with Corrections and Alterations.

AN APPENDIX,

In Answer to some late Passages of J. W. *of the* Society of Jesus, *concerning the* Prohibition *of* Scripture in Vulgar Languages *by the Council of* Trent.

SInce the Publication of the foregoing Book, I have met with a Reflexion upon it made by *J. W.* in the Preface to a *Treatise* lately *Reprinted* by him. Wherein, *he observes that a great part of the Objections made against them are either grounded on mistakes, or touch points of Discipline not of Faith, which alone they are bound to defend.* This last Clause I could not but wonder at, since the new Title of his Book is, *A Defence of the Doctrine and Holy Rites of the Roman Catholick Church*, &c. Why should *I. W.* take such needless pains to *defend the Rites of the Church*, if they are bound to defend nothing but Points of Faith? I had thought the Honour and Authority of the Church had been concerned in its Commands and Prohibitions, as well as in its

Definitions and Decrees. And although it be not pretended, that the Church is Infallible in Matters of Diſcipline; yet it is a ſtrong Prejudice againſt any pretence to Infallibility in a Church, if it be found to err notoriouſly in any thing of general Concernment to the *Catholick Church.*

But how comes my late Book to be made an Example? *As for inſtance,* (ſaith he) *I find in a Book newly Publiſhed, with this Title,* The Council of Trent Examin'd and Diſprov'd by Catholick Tradition, *that for* 15 *Pages together Dr.* St. *labours to prove that there is no Catholick Tradition againſt Tranſlating Scripture into Vulgar Languages.* Whereas I expreſly ſay, that the *Prohibition* of reading the Scripture ſo tranſlated without a particular Licenſe, was that which I undertook to ſhew could not be juſtified by any Catholick Tradition; And that there was a General Conſent of the Catholick Church, not merely for the Tranſlations of Scripture into Vulgar Languages, but for the free uſe of them by the People. Which I made out by theſe Particulars,

1. That where-ever the Chriſtian Religion prevailed, the Scripture was Tranſlated into the Vulgar Language for the Peoples benefit. Which I proved from the Ancient *Italick* Verſions before St. *Jerom's* time, the *Gothick, Perſian, Armenian, Syriack, Coptick* and *Æthiopick* Tranſlations; without the leaſt prohibition of the Common uſe of them.

2. That where a Language grew into Diſuſe among the People there the Scripture was Tranſlated into the Tongue which was better underſtood. And for this I inſtanced in the *Arabick Verſions* after the prevalency of

of the *Saracens* in the Eaſtern and Southern Parts, and after the *Moors* coming into *Spain.*

3. That even after the Primitive Times, Chriſtian Princes and Biſhops did take Care that the People ſhould read the Scriptures in their own Language. For Princes, I inſtanced in *Ludovicus Pius* and *Alfred*; for Biſhops, in *Waldo* Biſhop of *Freſſing*, *Methodius* and *Cyrill*, &c.

4. That the Pope himſelf in the 9th Century did approve of it; and for a Reaſon common to all times and Churches, *viz.* that *All People and Languages were to praiſe God, and that God himſelf had ſo commanded.*

5. That *Gregory* VII. was the firſt Perſon who forbad the uſe of Scripture and Divine Offices in the Vulgar Tongue, and was not aſhamed to own that the Church ſaw cauſe to alter ſeveral things from what they were in the Primitive Church.

6. That upon the ſetting up the Inquiſition by *Innocent* III. this Prohibition took place in *France* and *Spain*, and other Places.

7. That ſome noted Divines of the Church of *Rome* have highly commended it; and ſaid that the taking of it away would be pernicious and deſtructive to Faith and Devotion.

8. That the Prohibition in the Church of *Rome* is built on the Authority of the Council of *Trent*, which appointed the *Index* to be made, in which the fourth Rule forbids all Perſons the uſe of the Scripture in the Vulgar

Tongue without a particular Licenſe, and whoſoever preſumes to doe it is to be denied Abſolution.

9. From hence it follows, that the *Council of Trent* is evidently diſproved, as to *Catholick Tradition*, for any Foundation of ſuch a *Prohibition*.

And what now ſaith *J. W.* againſt all this? *He would gladly know againſt whom I diſpute.* Againſt *J. S.* and all ſuch who would make the World believe the *Council* of *Trent* did proceed upon *Catholick Tradition*. To prove I am miſtaken, he tells me *in his 6th Chap. I may find an Account of ſeveral new Tranſlations of Scripture into Vulgar Tongues, made by Catholicks and approved in the Roman Church.* Then he mentions *an Engliſh Tranſlation made by the* Rhemiſh *and* Doway *Colleges*; *and in French by the Doctours of* Lovain; *and ſome others.* What now follows from hence? Is it any *Miſtake* in me to ſay, There was ſuch a Prohibition of Reading the Scripture in the Church of *Rome*, and inforced by the Rule made by Appointment of the Council of *Trent*? This had been indeed to the purpoſe if it could have been proved. I do not deny, that there have been ſuch *Tranſlations* made, where it was found impoſſible to hinder all *Tranſlations*; and the uſe of them have been connived at or allow'd to ſome particular perſons, whom they were otherwiſe ſecure of. But ſuch Tranſlations are like the *Galeniſts* allowing ſome *Chymical Medicines* to their Patients; they declare againſt their uſe as dangerous; but if the Patient will have them, then pray take them of my Apothecary, who is a very honeſt man and prepares miſchievous Medicines better than another. This is juſt the Caſe of the Church of *Rome*, as to *Tranſlations* of *Scripture*; If we ask their Opinion in general, whether Tranſlations

Tranſlations be allowable or not, their Anſwer hath been formerly very free and open, by no means; for they are very dangerous and miſchievous things. And here beſides thoſe I have already mentioned, I could produce many more to the ſame purpoſe. But alas! theſe men lived before the Age of *Miſ-repreſenting* and *Expounding*. Now all is *Miſtake* on our ſide, and *Infallibility* on theirs. We cannot for our hearts underſtand their Doctrines or Practices aright, although we take never ſo much pains and care to doe it. One would think by the preſent way of dealing with us, that the Church of *Rome* were like *the New Name on the White Stone, which no man knows but he that hath it*; and ſo it were impoſſible for any elſe to underſtand it, but ſuch as are in it. I thought my ſelf pretty ſecure from *Miſtaking*, when I pitched on the *Council* of *Trent* for my *Guide*. But it ſeems, I am *miſtaken* here too: How ſo? Did not the *Council* of *Trent* appoint the Congregation of the *Index* at firſt, *Seſſ.* 18? Did it not own that the Matters of it were prepared before its Diſſolution? And if there were a *Prohibition* of the free uſe of the Scripture in Vulgar Languages by the Rules of the *Index*, is not the Council of *Trent* juſtly chargeable with that *Prohibition?* Eſpecially when the Title in the *Roman* Edition is *Regulæ Indicis Sacroſanctæ Synodi Tridentinæ juſſu editæ.* Apoc. 2. 17.

Jacob. Ledeſma was one of the ſame Society with *J. W.* and he frankly owns the *Prohibition* of reading the *Scripture*, made by the Rule of the *Index*, to have been done by the Authority of the *Council* of *Trent*.

Accedit ad hoc, Iucupletiſſimum Teſtimonium, atque Decretum ex Indice librorum prohibitorum per Patres à Tridentina Synodo delectos conſcripto & Authoritate Sanctiſſ. D. noſtri Pii 4. P. M. *comprobato Regula.* 4. Jac. Ledeſma. *De Divin. Script. quavis lingua non legend.* c. 51.

The *Faculty* at *Paris* in the Articles ſent to *Gregory* XIII. againſt the Tranſlation of *Rene Benoit*; ſeveral times own

own the *Rules* of the *Index* as done by the Council of *Trent*. *Quacunque Authoritate transferantur in Vulgarem linguam Biblia & edantur, vetat idem ſacroſanctum Concilium ea paſſim ſine diſcrimine permitti.*

The ſame *Ledeſma* goes farther, and vouches the Authority of the Council of *Trent* in this matter, from the Decree *Seſſ.* 23. c. 8. where it forbids all the Parts of the *Maſs* to be in the Vulgar Tongue. Which could not be reaſonable, if the Scripture were allowed to be tranſlated.

Alphonſ. à Caſtro *de hæret. Punit. l.* 3. *c.* 6.

Alphonſus à Caſtro, thinks the caſe ſo alike, *that a prohibition of one amounts to a prohibition of the other too, becauſe the greater Part of the Office is taken out of the Scriptures, and if the Scripture may be tranſlated*, he ſaith, *it muſt follow that Divine Offices ought to be in the vulgar Tongue.* But to return to the *Index*.

The Congregation of the *Index* was (as is ſaid) eſtabliſhed by the *Council* in the 18. *Seſſion* as the Council it ſelf owns in the laſt Seſſion; and withall, that the Rules of it were then formed, but *becauſe of the multiplicity and variety of the Books, the matter of the Index was referred to the Pope, and to be publiſhed by his Authority, as likewiſe the Catechiſm, Miſſal and Breviary.* So that the *Rules* of the *Index* have the ſame Authority in the *Church* of *Rome* with the *Roman Catechiſm, Miſſal and Breviary.*

Concil. Trid. Seſſ 25. c. 15.

(a) *Quod Indice & Regulis confectis per Patres à Generali Synodo Tridentina delectos ſanctum eſt—— Præter ea quæ Tridentinorum Patrum Regulis ſupradictis decreta ſunt.*

Pius IV. in his Bull, when he firſt ſet forth the *Index* A. D. 1564. owns *that it was finiſhed by the Fathers appointed by the Council of* Trent, *but it was remitted to him by the Council, that it might be approved by him and publiſhed by his Authority. And he ſtrictly commands the Rules of it to be obſerved under pain of Mortal Sin; and Excommunication, ipſo jure.* After him *Clement* VIII. in his (*a*) *Inſtructions* about the *Rules* of the *Index* owns them

them to be made by the *Fathers* of the Council of *Trent*, And the ſame Pope is ſo far from renewing *the Power of granting Licenſes to read the Scripture in the vulgar Languages*, that he declares againſt them. For by the *4th* Rule of the *Index*, *the Ordinary and Inquiſitor by the Advice of the Pariſh Prieſt or Confeſſor might permit Perſons to read the Bible in the vulgar Language, ſo the Tranſlation were made by Catholick Authours*; and it was apprehended by ſome, that the new Printing the *Rule* might be giving new Authority to Biſhops and Inquiſitors to grant Licenſes, therefore the Pope declares againſt it; and ſaith it *was contrary to the Command and uſe of the Roman Church and Inquiſition, which ought to be inviolably obſerved.* In purſuance of this we find in the *Roman Index* of *prohibited Books*, theſe words, *Biblia vulgari quocunque idiomate conſcripta*; i. e. *All Bibles in vulgar Languages are prohibited.* Therefore I cannot underſtand how the giving Licenſe to Perſons ſince the *Declaration* of *Clemens* VIII. is conſiſtent with the Duty which Perſons of that Communion owe to the *Authority* of *the Roman See*, unleſs they can produce a *Revocation* of the *Bull* of *Clemens* VIII. and ſome latter Explications of the *fourth Rule* which take away the force of his. But inſtead of that, *Alexander* VII. who publiſhed the *Index* again, after *Clement* VIII. owns that the firſt *Index* was made by Authority of the *Council* of *Trent*: and it is obſervable that in his Bull *A. D.* 1664. he not onely prefixes the *Rules* of the *Index*, but the *Obſervations* and *Inſtruction* of *Clement* VIII. and confirms all by his Apoſtolical authority; and injoyns the punctual Obſervation of the Orders contained therein inviolably; under the ſame pains which were expreſſed in the Bull of *Pius* IV. Therefore as far as I can underſtand, the Faculty

Qui ſacroſancti Concilii Tridentini auctoritate prodierat.

culty of granting Licenſes to reade the Tranſlations of the Bible is taken away as far as the Pope's authority can doe it.

To what purpoſe then are we told of ſome *modern Tranſlations*, as long as the uſe of them is forbidden by the Pope's Authority? And no Ordinaries can have Authority to grant Licenſes againſt the Popes ſolemn Declaration to the contrary; nor can any of that Communion with good Conſcience make uſe of them.

But I am told *there are Tranſlations approved in the Roman Church.* By whom have they been approved? By the Pope, or the *Congregation* of the *Index?* I do not find any ſuch Approbation given to any of them. But on the contrary even in *France*, ſuch *Tranſlations* have been vehemently oppoſed by the Biſhops and Divines there, as being repugnant to the Senſe of the *Roman* Church. And this is apparent by a Book publiſhed by Order of the *Gallican Clergy*, *A. D.* 1661. Wherein it is ſaid *that it was the common and unanimous Senſe and Practice of all Orthodox Perſons, that neither the Scriptures nor divine Offices ought to be put into Vulgar Languages, it being injurious to the Chriſtian Church, and giving Occaſion of Offence to the weak and unlearned.* How then can we imagine that ſuch *Tranſlations* ſhould not onely be allowed but *approved* among them?

E quibus pateat fuiſſe ſemper communem & unanimem Orthodoxorum omnium ſenſum ac uſum; divinos Libros ac Officia Eccleſiaſtica, vernaculo Idiomate neutiquam reddendi; utpote Chriſtianæ Reipubl. damnoſum, ac rudibus & imperitis ſcandali occaſionem præbens. Collectio Auctorum Verſion. vulg. damnant. Monit. ad Lector.

And beſides the entire Treatiſes there collected againſt them, of *Card. Hoſius*, *Lizetius*, *Spiritus Roterus*, *Ledeſma*, *&c.* and the Fragments and Teſtimonies of ſeveral others; we have a particular account of the proceedings of the *Sorbon* as to this matter.

In

In the *Cenſure* of *Eraſmus*, *Dec.* 17. 1527. the *Sorbon* declared *Vulgar Tranſlations of Scripture to be dangerous and pernicious.*

The like Declaration had been made before *A.D.* 1525. *and that all Tranſlations of the Bible, or of the Parts thereof ought rather to be ſuppreſſed than tolerated.*

A. D. 1607. The Faculty again declared, *that it did not approve any Tranſlations of Scripture into the Vulgar Language.*

But *J. W.* inſtances p. 26. *in ſome Tranſlations that have been approved*; as *a French Tranſlation by the Doctours of Lovain.* But in the *French Collection* before mention'd, I find, *that* A. D. 1620. Dec. 1. *a debate aroſe in the Faculty at* Lovain *about it*; *and the Faculty declared that it by no means approved of it.*

Another is of *Rene Benoit*; which was ſo far from being *approved*, that it was firſt condemned by the *Faculty* at *Paris*, and then ſent to *Rome* to be condemned by the Pope; which was effectually done; and *Gregory* XIII. directed his Bull to the Faculty of Divinity in *Paris*, *Nov.* 3. *A.D.* 1575. wherein he doth expreſly *forbid this Tranſlation*, *and reject it with an Anathema.*

Biblia ſupradicta omnino prohibemus, & ab Eccleſia Catholica ſub Anathemate rejicimus.

And yet this very *Tranſlation* of *Rene Benoit* is one of thoſe made by *Catholicks* and *approved in the Roman Church*; which *J. W.* refers me to. One of us two muſt needs be under a great Miſtake, but to whom it belongs I leave the Reader to determin.

The ſenſe of the *Gallican Clergy* in this matter doth fully appear by the Repreſentation which they ſent to *Alexander* VII. about the *Tranſlation* of the *Miſſal* into *French.* Which was done by *Voiſin* a *Doctour* of the *Faculty*,

eulty, and was publiſhed at *Paris* by the Permiſſion of *Cardinal de Retz* Archbiſhop there, and had the Approbation of ſome Doctours of the *Sorbon*. The reſt of the Biſhops and Clergy highly reſented this matter, and Aſſembled together to conſult about it, *Nov.* 29. 1660. where they propoſed two things to be conſidered. 1. The matter of Right, whether ſuch a Tranſlation were to be permitted or not. 2. The matter of Fact, whether this were a good Tranſlation or not. The debate was adjourned to *Dec.* 3. and from thence to the 7th on which they came to a Reſolution to ſuppreſs it. And a Circular Letter was ſent to all the Biſhops to forbid the uſe of it under pain of Excommunication; and the King deſired to interpoſe his Authority in it. *Dec.* 9. they agreed to ſend an account of the whole matter to the Pope in the name of the *Gallican Clergy*; wherein they declare their great diſlike of it, *as contrary to the Cuſtom of the Church, and as pernicious to the Souls of Men.* And in the Body of it, they ſay *that they look on the Tranſlations of Scripture into vulgar Languages as the great occaſion of the Northern Hereſies*; *and quote* Vincentius Lerinenſis, *ſaying that the Scripture is the Book of Hereticks.* And after add, *that they had ſent to the Pope their Condemnation of all Tranſlations of Scripture and Divine Offices into the Vulgar Languages.* This was ſubſcribed by the *General Aſſembly* of the *Clergy*, Jan. 7. 1661.

Illam omnino improbamus tanquam ab Eccleſiæ conſuetudine alienam, nec niſi cum ingenti animarum pernicie conjunctam.

The Pope ſent a *Brief* in Anſwer, which was received *Feb.* 25. wherein he very Tragically complains *that ſome Sons of Perdition in* France *had to the ruine of Souls, and in Contempt of the Churches Laws and Practice, arrived to that degree of madneſs as to tranſlate the Roman Miſſal*

ſal into French. And he charges the doing of it not onely with *Novelty*, but *Diſobedience*, *Sedition*, *Schiſm*, &c. and declares *that he abhorred and deteſted it*; *and for ever damned*, *reprobated and forbad it*, *under pain of Excommunication*; *and requires all Perſons to deliver up their Books to the ſeveral Ordinaries that they might be burnt.*

I now deſire *J. W.* to inform me whether we are bound to believe that in *France Tranſlations of Scripture into the vulgar Language are allowed and approved?* I am really ſo unwilling to *miſtake*, that I take the beſt care I can to be rightly informed. I have no deſign either to deceive others, or to be deceived my ſelf; and therefore have not truſted to ſecond-hand Evidence; but ſearched and conſidered the Authours themſelves, whoſe Teſtimonies I rely upon. I am certain I have fallen into no willfull miſtake, but have truly and impartially ſtated things according to the cleareſt Evidence I could find; and therefore I think it ſome what hard to be told, *that our Objections are grounded on Miſtakes*, and eſpecially as to this matter *about the Prohibition of reading Scripture in the Vulgar Language*; for I hope I have made it appear not onely that there is ſuch a *Prohibition* but that it is founded on the *Authority* of the *Council* of *Trent*.

And if it be ſo, then it ſerves my main deſign, *viz.* to prove that it went off from *Catholick Tradition*, for if there were ſo many Tranſlations of old without the leaſt prohibition, and there be ſince the *Council* of *Trent*, ſo ſevere a one, backed with the Pope's Authority, here muſt be a very great change in *Tradition*. For that is accounted *pernicious and miſchievous to the Souls of men*, which before was accounted uſefull and beneficial to them. If the Phyſicians in one Age ſhould

condemn the common Reading of *Hippocrates* and *Galen* as deſtructive to the Health of mens bodies, which thoſe of former Ages extremely commended, would not any one ſay, there was a great Change in the Opinions of Phyſicians, and that they did by no means hold to the Judgment of thoſe before them? If the common Lawyers ſhould now ſay *Littleton's Tenures* is a Book very unfit to be read by young Lawyers, that it fills their heads with ſeditious and dangerous Principles, and therefore ought to be taken out of their hands; would not any one ſay, here is a wonderfull Change, for no ſuch thing was ever apprehended before, but the Book was thought very uſefull and proper to inſtruct Students in ſome fundamental Points of the Law?

When *Manna was rained from Heaven in the Wilderneſs for* 40. *years*, and for 30. of them every man gathered his own ſhare and proportion, and ate of it as he ſaw cauſe; would it not have been thought a ſtrange alteration among them, if after 30. years a ſett of Phyſicians ſhould have riſen up and told the People "it was true, *Manna was Angels food*, but if "they had not great care in the taking it, and uſed "it promiſcuouſly, it would turn them to *Devils*; or "at leaſt it would fill them with ſuch diſtempers, as "they would never be able to reach to *Canaan*? This might be pretended to be great Care and Tenderneſs of them, in theſe *new Phyſicians*; but on the other ſide, they would tell them, "they had done very well with "their eating Manna for 30. years together; and there "had been no ſuch diſtempers among them, but ſuch "as humane nature is always ſubject to; that ſuch an "alteration might be of worſe Conſequence than their "common

" common uſe of Manna; for ſo it was at firſt appoin-
" ted and ſo it had continued, and they could not
" tell but their new Phyſicians might be worſe to them
" than their old diſtempers; and they could never be-
" lieve that could be ſo hurtfull which God himſelf
" had appointed for their food.

The former Diſcourſe makes the Application needleſs.

But after all, it is ſaid: *This is but a point of Diſcipline and not of Faith; and in ſuch the Church may change her Meaſures.* To that I anſwer,

1. It is more than a point of Diſcipline, for it is changing the *Rule* of *Faith* with reſpect to the People. While the Scriptures were in the hands of the People, they reſolved their Faith into the *Word of God*, as it was delivered to them and underſtood by them. But when that is taken out of their hands and they are bid to Truſt to the *Churches Teſtimony* for matters of Faith; they have a different Reſolution of their Faith and a different Ground and Reaſon of believing. For they cannot ground their Faith upon a written Rule who are uncapable of underſtanding it.

2. It is no matter of Diſcipline to overthrow the deſign of publiſhing the Scripture for the univerſal Benefit of the Church of God. And this the *Janſeniſts* have well proved in Defence of their Tranſlation of the New Teſtament againſt the Prohibitions of it. " For, ſay they, the Prohibition of reading the
" Scripture under pain of Excommunication, is it ſelf *Dialogue* 2.
" contrary to the Goſpel and ought not to be obey'd. P. 26. 29.
" For Bread and nouriſhment is not more neceſſary

to

" to preſerve the Life of the Body, than the Word of
" God is to uphold the Life of the Soul. That for
" men to ſpeak of ſo much danger in reading the
" Scripture is to reflect very diſhonourably on the
" Providence and Groodneſs of God; for it was
" by means of Tranſlations in Vulgar Languages that
" God's Word came to be known to the World, and
" the Goſpel was at firſt publiſhed in thoſe Tongues,
" which were moſt generally underſtood. And there-
" fore thoſe do manifeſtly oppoſe the deſign and me-
" thod of Providence for advancing the Goſpel, who
" decry Tranſlations of Scripture, as pernicious to
P. 63. " the Souls of Men. And farther, that ſuch a pro-
" hibition, is a Contempt of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt
" and a deſign to ſuppreſs the Goſpel; and a Con-
" tradiction to the Will and Command of God; A
" Contempt of the Scripture, which was intended to be
" underſtood by all, A Contempt both of Councils and
" Fathers, which looked on the Scripture as the beſt
" Judge of Controverſies, and who adviſed all be-
" lievers to a continual reading of the Word of God.

If after all this, the *Council* of *Trent* could ſo notoriouſly err not onely againſt *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, but *Tradition* too in ſuch a Matter of Concernment to the Souls of Men, as this is, it will be hardly poſſible to perſuade Men, it could not as well err in any Point of Faith. And it renders the whole proceeding ſuſpicious as to particular Points, when the *Rule* of *Faith* is ſo induſtriouſly kept out of the hands of the People. For thoſe who follow their Inſtructions, are never aſhamed to produce their Credentials.

Dialogues in Anſwer to T. G. Part. 4. As to what *J. W.* ſaith in his Book concerning *Jupiter*, &c. I had anſwered it ſo fully many years ſince, that

that I have Reaſon to expect a Reply to what I had there ſaid in my own Vindication, before I can think it fit to trouble the World with needleſs Repetitions. And it were hard for me to be put to Anſwer again to the ſame things, when a Perſon will not take the pains to ſee whether he were not Anſwer'd already.

THE END.